Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

A COMMENTARY

ON

THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE

BY

F. GODET,

DOCTOR AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, NEUCHATEL.

TRANSLATED FROM THE SECOND FRENCH EDITION BY

E. W. SHALDERS AND M. D. CUSIN.

WITH PREFACE AND NOTES TO THE AMERICAN EDITION BY

JOHN HALL, D.D.

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY

NEW YORK AND LONDON

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY 2, KANSAS

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1887, by
FUNK & WAGNALLS,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington, D. C.

226.407
G582

PREFACE OF THE AMERICAN EDITOR.

THE immediate occasion for the issue of a separate commentary on Luke's Gospel is found in the fact that from it are taken the Sabbath-school lessons of the International uniform series for the former half of the year on which we are so soon to enter. When it is remembered how many millions of pupils receive instruction according to this widely-accepted arrangement, it will not seem unimportant that hundreds of thousands of teachers—many of them busily engaged in ordinary life—should have all possible aid in the work of preparing themselves to teach. Who does not crave a blessing on them in their self-denying work? Let us ask that He whose word they employ as the educating spiritual power, will make this work one of the forms in which the blessing will come to them.

But it is not only such Christian laborers who are now interested in securing aid to a full understanding of Luke's Gospel. It is a matter for true rejoicing that, as the school of the Sabbath is in closest connection with the Church, and doing a part of the Church's work, ministers labor in so many forms to increase the power of their fellow-toilers by printed and oral exposition of the lessons, and in many instances by systematic treatment of the coming Sabbath-school lesson at the week-day service. This is done in many cases where ministers are far removed from libraries and from the stimulus of literary fellowship, and where also the means at their disposal make it difficult for them to procure expensive theological or exegetical works. To bring such within their easier reach is not unworthy of effort: their power for good as religious educators is thus increased in this and in every other department of their difficult but beneficent labors.

At first sight it might seem as if the commentary of M. Godet were too voluminous and too comprehensive in its plan to be of use to Sabbath-school teachers. But there are considerations to be taken into account on the other side. (*a*) No one unacquainted practically with this great agency of our time has any idea of the immense advance in biblical knowledge made during the past decade, in which uniformity of topic enabled publishing houses and societies to provide the best help for teachers. (*b*) To keep a high standard of attainment and effort before this great body of laborers is desirable in itself. That all do not reach the ideal qualification is no reason for withdrawing the means toward it which a certain proportion can and will employ. (*c*) The ideas of Paulus, Strauss, Rénan and other authors of similar tendency are being diffused, and are presented with more or less show of learning, and especially of "culture" and "enlightenment," by many who do not have them from the originals, and to many who never come in contact with the works as a whole, but only in the unqualified eulogies which accompany their names when they are being used against evangelical interpretation.

It is desirable in the highest degree that intelligent Christians who are teachers of others should know of an "antidote" to the "bane" of what Godet concisely calls "criticism" throughout his work. This consideration will reconcile any intelligent reader who has learned to identify himself with the cause of the truth to many portions of this commentary devoted to the exposure of the shallow, arbitrary, inconsistent, and arrogant way in which Rationalism deals with Scripture. It is good for such readers to understand that, though not themselves able to grapple with such

12537

critics, nor indeed called upon to do it, they have been dealt with, not only by the devout but by the learned, and that here as elsewhere, if a little scholarship leads away from intelligent simple faith, more scholarship brings back to it. That Greek, Latin, and Hebrew are quoted will not be an objection to the work, especially as a translation for the most part accompanies the quotations.

Not at all as though the present writer were qualified and entitled, by position or by attainments, to commend Professor Godet's work, but with the view to deepen hopeful and expectant interest in it at the outset, a few considerations suggested by a very thorough and careful reading of every page of it are here concisely stated. In the Protestant churches of France and Switzerland we cannot but feel on many grounds a deep interest. This work has been among them—as the work of one of their own children—for nearly twelve years, with ever-widening influence for good. There is no name among them more trusted than that of its author, and that name is now a possession of all the churches. He had already proved his capacity for such a task as the interpretation of Luke, by his previous work on John's Gospel, and he felt the importance and the fitness of following up that work by a commentary on one of the Synoptists.

There are many reasons why such a writer should decide on Luke when he has to make a choice. Luke's is the Gospel for the Gentiles ; it is the Gospel in which Jesus is seen as the Saviour of men as men. It is marked (as Bernard in his admirable Bampton lectures on the "Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament" has shown) by "breadth of human sympathy and special fitness for the Gentile mind," just as is that of Matthew for the Jew inquiring after the evidences of Christ's Messiahship, and that of John for the Christian, forced by the progress of thought to discriminate between the truth of Christianity and the refinements eagerly and often amicably identified in form with its divine elements.

Professor Godet has not written for professed theologians, nor has he aimed at embodying in his work those devout reflections of which Scott, Matthew Henry, and—in their own peculiar way—the commentaries edited by Langè, are depositories. He has aimed at giving the connection and meaning of the narrative, and as he proceeds, at brushing aside the cobwebs which Rationalist or mythical interpreters heap on the inspired page. He does not ignore the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, enjoyed by the writers, but at the same time he is not afraid to follow the critics as they examine and pronounce upon the details of that human side, which we have in the written, as we have also in the Incarnate, Word.

If it be alleged, as it may truly be, that our author's arguments are often subtle, especially when dealing with the class of questions belonging to the harmony of the Gospels, and the assumption of one original document from which the Synoptists culled at pleasure, it is also true that they are convincing. The student of the book will moreover be rewarded for the time and pains bestowed on the argument, by the knowledge of many an unintended corroboration of Gospel narrative, interesting in this relation, and often interesting on its own account. Examples may be cited, like the College of Rome in the days of the Emperor (p. 11), which had supervision of physicians, and the license of which implied literary culture and professional attainment on the part of its possessor. The "beloved physician" is, it might have been presumed beforehand, in these respects just such as we are bound to infer from his writings. But the discussion in which our author, in pursuit of his plan, frequently engages has many incidental attractions to a lover of God's truth. If Ration-

alism be well founded, then absolute agreement ought to mark its conclusions, and perfect harmony should prevail among its exponents. Professor Godet never shrinks from showing how widely apart the very men go who allege that the whole thing is so plain—so remote from the region of the mysterious and supernatural—that it must appear at once to any enlightened intellect. (See for illustration pp. 24–26 ; 144, 145, etc.)

Nor is the discussion—commonly thrown into the form of notes—unrelieved by occasional flashes of sarcasm and irony. We should infer from his book that Professor Godet adds to power of grouping, of ingenious and exact combination (see pp. 43, 109), a certain quickness of wit, only exercised here indeed when the provocation is undoubted. "Our evangelists," says he (p. 240) "could never have anticipated that they would ever have such perverse interpreters."

On the other hand, the freshness and force of his own interpretations—as in the turning of "the hearts of the fathers to the children" (p. 49), and the deputation from John the Baptist (pp. 220–224)—find an appropriate vehicle in clear, vivacious, and often eloquent language. See as illustration the amplification of the parabolic language regarding "new wine and old bottles" (p. 180). Even as a bright thought or an unexpected felicitous phrase in the most earnest sermon will sometimes surprise the hearer into a smile, so the keenness of analysis (see p. 147) and the detection of nice evidences and apologetic considerations (as in pp. 57, 66, 101, etc.) will often touch the mind of a reader as with a pleasant surprise. Nor is there wanting a fine suggestiveness in many of his paragraphs, as when he calls demoniacal possession the caricature of divine inspiration. How much of that awful antithesis runs through revelation, as in the "mystery of godliness" and the "mystery of iniquity," the Christ and the Antichrist! Satan is truly in many things the ape of Deity.

The power of keen analysis of Professor Godet, of which an illustration may be seen on p. 147, will be found usefully employed in the concluding and very valuable portion of his work, when, having gone over the Gospel exegetically, he comes to deal formally with the divergent theories of Rationalism on the origin and objects of the four Gospels. It may be thought, possibly, by some, that it is enough to overthrow views contradictory of one another, and of vital principles, and that one is under no obligation to provide a genesis of these inspired records. But so long as men will ask after *the how*, within certain limits an answer will be attempted ; and that of this volume does not transcend the limits of modesty and reverence. The Church, in various ways, including works like this, can "move" and "induce" to a "high and reverend esteem of the Holy Scriptures ;" but of the Gospels this is emphatically true, that "the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is to give glory to God), the full discovery made of the only way of man's salvation, the many other incomparable excellences, and the entire perfection thereof," are the arguments by which they "abundantly evidence themselves to be the Word of God."

It could hardly be supposed that no phrase in a work like this, and coming to us through a translation, would invite criticism. The author's views of the *Parousia*, which Greek word our continental friends are fond of using for the "coming" (Matt. 24 : 3 ; 1 Cor. 15 : 23), applied to Christ, are not formally stated ; but there are intimations of their nature, as on p. 406, which would not satisfy a large portion of

the evangelical churches. It is possible, however, that a calm and orderly statement of these opinions would make a different impression. This we infer particularly from declarations made on p. 452, which appear to be at variance with those commonly held by the advocates of two resurrections, divided by an interval more or less defined in their representations. It is to be remembered also that our author, in dealing with the Tübingen school, is forced to discuss with great freedom what may be called the human side of the origin of the Gospels. This may account for such an infelicitous phrase as "chronological error" on p. 116. It must not be forgotten that, as devout scientists may discuss the mode of producing our existing world without questioning its divine origin, or ignoring a Creator, so reverent scholarship may examine the processes by which holy oracles come to us, without impugning the fact that they are the utterances of the Divine Teacher, given by inspiration of the Holy Ghost. The *mode* of inspiration will probably remain a mystery; but that limitation in the matter of our knowledge will no more put it in doubt as a fact, in a candid mind, than ignorance of the process it details will imply question of the regeneration by the Holy Ghost. In both mysterious and gracious works the wind bloweth where it listeth, and we hear the sound and reap the benefits, but cannot tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth.

While Sabbath-school teachers will not, for the most part, follow with interest the examination of the views of Bleek, Baur, Weiss, Klosterman, Holtzmann, and others, we do not doubt that they will be read with interest by ministers. They who love and teach definite truth will be able to understand how an evangelical prophet may break into sarcasm (as on p. 435) while giving articulate form to the designs of Christ's enemies. They will appreciate such clear statement as they will find on pp. 435–6; such *points* as that made regarding the Sabbath at p. 450, and the treatment of the current objection founded on the references to Annas and Caiaphas (p. 480). The analysis of our Lord's use of John's baptism in his struggle with his truculent foes is an admirable illustration of the author's power to place himself in the midst of the conflict waged by the Truth incarnate against sacerdotalism and perverted and partisan zeal. One may hesitate to take the net cast on the other side, as pointing to the ingathering of the heathen, just as the conclusions suggested on p. 495 may be left among the open questions without lessening admiration for the author's painstaking ingenuity. Nor, finally, can any attentive reader fail to notice the wealth of allusion and the variety of sources whence light is made to shine on the sacred pages; as, for example (p 563), in dealing with the evangelist's differences in forms of speech, when Basil the Great is adduced as reporting that "down to his time (fourth century) the Church possessed no written liturgy for the Holy Supper—the sacramental prayers and formulæ were transmitted *by unwritten tradition.*"

It is with great satisfaction, then, that the present writer wishes God-speed, by this prefatory note, to a volume which is at once learned and reverent, distinct in its exhibition of the positive truth, and vigorously controversial, in which the clearest estimate of the several Gospels is complemented by just views of Him of whose manysided excellency and glory they are the fourfold presentation.

The work, it is hardly needful to say, is unabridged, every Greek and Hebrew word being reproduced. Only such brief notes (indicated by his initials) as might save Sabbath-school teachers from misapprehension—ministerial readers do not require them—have been added by the writer, and these not without hesitation. It is hoped that this issue in popular form of one of the Messrs. Clark's publications—by which such service has been rendered to Christian literature—will call attention to their other translations in quarters where they have not yet gone. It is hardly needful to say that Messrs. Scribner, the only house in America that has sought to make a market for the work (and therefore entitled to be consulted) give their full assent to this issue—an assent that will be appreciated by those who desire to send the results of the ripest scholarship among all classes of Christian students and laborers.

J. HALL.

Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York,
December, 1880.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.

A YEAR and half has passed away—and how swiftly !—since the publication of this Commentary, and already a second edition has become necessary. I bless the Lord for the acceptance which this work has met with in the churches of Switzerland and of France, and I hail it as a symptom of that revived interest in exegetical studies, which has always appeared to me one of their most urgent needs. I tender my special thanks to the authors of those favorable reviews which have given effectual aid toward the attainment of this result.

Almost every page of this second edition bears the traces of corrections in the form of my former work ; but the substance of its exegesis and criticism remains the same. Of only one passage, or rather of only one term (*second-first*, 6 : 1), has the interpretation been modified. Besides that, I have made a number of additions occasioned by the publication of two works, one of which I have very frequently quoted, and the other as often controverted. I refer to M. Gess' book, "Sur la Personne et l'Œuvre de Christ" (first part), and to "La Vie de Jésus" by M. Keim (the last two volumes).

In a recent article of the "Protestantische Kirchenzeitung," M. Holtzmann has challenged my critical standpoint as being determined by a dogmatic prepossession. But has he forgotten the advantage which Strauss took in his first "Vie de Jésus" of the hypothesis of Giesseler, which I have defended ? The reader having the whole before him will judge. He will see for himself whether the attempt to explain in a natural and rational way the origin of the three synoptical texts by means of common written sources is successful. There is one fact especially which still waits for explanation—namely, the *Aramaisms* of Luke. These *Aramaisms* are met with not only in passages which belong exclusively to this Hellenistic writer, but also in those which are common to him and the other writers, who were of Jewish origin, and in whose parallel passages nothing of a similar kind is to be found ! This fact remains as a rock against which all the various hypotheses I have controverted are completely shattered, and especially that of Holtzmann. May not the somewhat ungenerous imputation of the Professor of Heidelberg, whose earnest labors no one admires more than myself, have been inspired by a slight feeling of wounded self-esteem ?

And now, may this Commentary renew its course with the blessing of the Lord, to whose service it is consecrated ; and may its second voyage be as prosperous and short as the first ! F. G.

NEUCHATEL, August, 1870.

EXTRACTS FROM THE PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

A Commentary on the Gospel of John remains an unfinished work so long as it is left unaccompanied by a similar work on at least one of the synoptical Gospels. Of these three writings, the Gospel of Luke appeared to me best fitted to serve as a complement to the exegetical work which I had previously published, because, as M. Sabatier has well shown in his short but substantial "Essai sur les Sources de la Vie de Jésus," Luke's writing constitutes, in several important respects, a transition between the view taken by John and that which forms the basis of the synoptical literature.*

The exegetical method pursued is very nearly the same as in my preceding Commentary. I have not written merely for professed theologians; nor have I aimed directly at edification. This work is addressed, in general, to those readers of culture, so numerous at the present day, who take a heart-felt interest in the religious and critical questions which are now under discussion. To meet their requirements, a translation has been given of those Greek expressions which it was necessary to quote, and technical language has as far as possible been avoided. The most advanced ideas of modern unbelief circulate at the present time in all our great centres of population. In the streets of our cities, workmen are heard talking about the conflict between St. Paul and the other apostles of Jesus Christ. We must therefore endeavor to place the results of a real and impartial Biblical science within reach of all. I repeat respecting this Commentary what I have already said of its predecessor: it has been written, not so much with a view to its being consulted, as read.

From the various readings, I have had to select those which had a certain value, or presented something of interest. A commentary cannot pretend to supply the place of a complete critical edition such as all scientific study requires. Since I cannot in any way regard the eighth edition of Tischendorf's text just published as a standard text, though I gratefully acknowledge its aid as absolutely indispensable, I have adopted the received text as a basis in indicating the various readings; but I would express my earnest desire for an edition of the Byzantine text that could be regarded as a standard authority.

Frequently I have contented myself with citing the *original* text of the ancient manuscripts, without mentioning the changes made in it by later hands; but whenever these changes offered anything that could be of any interest, I have indicated them.

If I am asked with what scientific or religious assumptions I have approached this study of the third Gospel, I reply, With these two only: that the authors of our Gospels were men of *good sense* and *good faith*.

* The publishers intend, if these volumes on Luke meet with a favorable reception, to bring out M. Godet's celebrated Commentary on John in an English dress. Indeed, they would have followed the author's order of publication, but that they waited to take advantage of a second edition, which is preparing for the press.—TRANS.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1-32
Section I.—Traces of the Existence of the Third Gospel in the Primitive Church	1
Section II.—The Author	10
Section III.—Composition of the Third Gospel	18
Section IV.—Sources of the Third Gospel	21
Section V.—Preservation of the Third Gospel	29
THE TITLE OF THE GOSPEL	32
THE PROLOGUE, 1 : 1-4	33
FIRST PART.	
THE NARRATIVES OF THE INFANCY, 1 : 5-2 : 52	41-104
First Narrative : Announcement of the Birth of John the Baptist, 1 : 5-25	43
Second Narrative : Announcement of the Birth of Jesus, 1 : 26-38	53
Third Narrative : Mary's Visit to Elizabeth, 1 : 39-56	59
Fourth Narrative : Birth and Circumcision of John the Baptist, 1 : 57-80	67
Fifth Narrative : Birth of the Saviour, 2 : 1-20	73
Sixth Narrative : Circumcision and Presentation of Jesus, 2 : 21-40	84
Seventh Narrative : The Child Jesus at Jerusalem, 2 : 41-52	90
General Considerations on Chaps. 1 and 2	94
SECOND PART.	
THE ADVENT OF THE MESSIAH, 3 : 1-4 : 13	105-145
First Narrative : The Ministry of John the Baptist, 3 : 1-20	105
Second Narrative : The Baptism of Jesus, 3 : 21, 22	117
On the Baptism of Jesus	121
Third Narrative : The Genealogy of Jesus, 3 : 23-38	126
Fourth Narrative : The Temptation, 4 : 1-13	133
On the Temptation	142
THIRD PART.	
THE MINISTRY OF JESUS IN GALILEE, 4 : 14-9 : 50	146-281
First Cycle : Visits to Nazareth and Capernaum, 4 : 14-44	148
On the Miracles of Jesus	162
Second Cycle : From the Calling of the First Disciples to the Choice of the Twelve, 5 : 1-6 : 11	163
Third Cycle : From the Choice of the Twelve to their First Mission, 6 : 12-8 : 56	188
Fourth Cycle : From the Sending forth of the Twelve to the Departure from Galilee, 9 : 1-50	252

FOURTH PART.

PAGE

The Journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, 9 : 51–19 : 27 283–423
First Cycle : The Departure from Galilee—First Days of the Journey, 9 : 51–13 : 21 288
Second Cycle : New Series of Incidents in the Journey, 13 : 22–17 : 10 359
Third Cycle : The Last Scenes in the Journey, 17 : 11–19 : 27 401

FIFTH PART.

The Sojourn at Jerusalem, 19 : 28–21 : 38 424–456
First Cycle : The Entry of Jesus into Jerusalem, 19 : 28–44 424
Second Cycle : The Reign of Jesus in the Temple, 19 : 45–21 : 4 428
Third Cycle : The Prophecy of the Destruction of Jerusalem, 21 : 5–38 443

SIXTH PART.

The Passion, 22 and 23 457–501
First Cycle : The Preparation for the Passion, 22 : 1–46 457
Second Cycle : The Passion, 22 : 47–23 : 46 476
Third Cycle : Close of the History of the Passion, 23 : 47–56 496
Conclusion regarding the Day of Christ's Death 499

SEVENTH PART.

The Resurrection and Ascension, 24 502–517
Of the Resurrection of Jesus 511
Of the Ascension 515

CONCLUSION.

Chap. I.—The Characteristics of the Third Gospel 518
Chap. II.—The Composition of the Third Gospel 536
Chap. III.—The Sources of Luke, and the Relation of the Synoptics to one another 549
Chap. IV.—The Beginnings of the Church 567

INTRODUCTION.

THE Introduction of a Biblical Commentary is not designed to solve the various questions relating to the origin of the book under consideration. This solution must be the result of the study of the book itself, and not be assumed beforehand. The proper work of introduction is to *prepare* the way for the study of the sacred book ; it should propose questions, not solve them.

But there is one side of the labor of criticism which may, and indeed ought to be treated before exegesis—the *historical*. And by this we understand : 1. The study of such facts of ecclesiastical history as may throw light upon the time of publication and the sources of the work which is to engage our attention ; 2. The review of the various opinions which have been entertained respecting the origin of this book, particularly in modern times. The first of these studies supplies exegetical and critical labor with its starting-point ; the second determines its aim. The possession of these two kinds of information is the condition of the maintenance and advancement of science.

This introduction, then, will aim at making the reader acquainted with—

I. The earliest traces of *the existence of our Gospel*, going back as far as possible in the history of the primitive Church.

II. The statements made by ancient writers as to *the person of the author*, and the opinions current at the present day on this point.

III. The information furnished by tradition respecting *the circumstances in which this writing was composed* (its readers, date, locality, design), as well as the different views which criticism has taken of these various questions.

IV. The ideas which scholars have formed of *the sources* whence the author derived the subject-matter of his narrations.

V. Lastly, the documents by means of which *the text* of this writing has been preserved to us.

An introduction of this kind is not complete without a conclusion in which the questions thus raised find their solution. This conclusion should seek to combine the facts established by tradition with the results obtained from exegesis.

SEC. I.—TRACES OF THE EXISTENCE OF THE THIRD GOSPEL IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

We take as our starting-point the middle of the second century, and our aim is not to come down the stream, but to ascend it. It is admitted, indeed, that at this epoch our Gospel was universally known and received, not only in *the great Church* (an expression of Celsus, about 150), but also by the sects which were detached from it.

This admission rests on some indisputable quotations from this book in Theophilus of Antioch (about 170) and Irenæus (about 180), and in the "Letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne" (in 177) ; on the fact, amply verified by the testimony of Clement of Alexandria, that the Gnostic Heracleon had published a commentary on the Gospel of Luke as well as on the Gospel of John (between 175–195) ;* on the

* See, for the fact, Grabe, "Spicilegium," sec. ii. t. i. p. 8 ; and for the date, Lipsius, "Die Zeit des Marcion und des Heracleon," in Hilgenfeld's "Zeitschrift," 1867.

very frequent use which Valentinus, or at least writers of his school, made of this Gospel; lastly, on numerous quotations from Luke, acknowledged by all scholars at the present day, contained in the "Clementine Homilies" (about 160). It is not surprising, therefore, that Origen ranks Luke's work among the number of *those four Gospels admitted by all the churches under heaven*, and that Eusebius places it among the *homologoumena* of the new covenant. The only matter of importance here is to investigate that obscure epoch, the first half of the second century, for any indications which may serve to prove the presence and influence of our Gospel. We meet with them in four departments of inquiry—in the field of heresy, in the writings of the Fathers, in the pseudepigraphical literature, and lastly, in the biblical writings.

1. Heresy.—*Marcion, Cerdo, Basilides.*

Marcion, a son of a bishop of Pontus, who was excommunicated by his own father, taught at Rome from 140–170.* He proposed to purify the Gospel from the Jewish elements which the twelve, by reason of their education and Israelitish prejudices, had necessarily introduced into it. In order more effectually to remove this alloy, he taught that the God who created the world and legislated for the Jews was different from the supreme God who revealed Himself in Jesus Christ, and was only an inferior and finite being; that for this reason the Jewish law rested exclusively on justice, while the Gospel was founded on charity. According to him, St. Paul alone had understood Jesus. Further, in the canon which Marcion formed, he only admitted the Gospel of Luke (on account of its affinity with the teaching of Paul) and ten epistles of this apostle. But even in these writings he felt himself obliged to suppress certain passages; for they constantly assume the divine character of the Old Testament, and attribute the creation of the visible universe to the God of Jesus Christ. Marcion, in conformity with his ideas about matter, denied the reality of the body of Jesus; and on this point, therefore, he found himself in conflict with numerous texts of Paul and Luke. The greater part of the modifications of Luke's text which were exhibited, according to the statements of Tertullian and Epiphanius, in the Gospel used by Marcion and his adherents, are to be accounted for in this way.

Notwithstanding this, the relation between the Gospel of Luke and that of this heretic has in modern times been represented in a totally different light. And the reason for this is not hard to find. The relation which we have just pointed out between these two writings, if clearly made out, is sufficient to prove that, at the time of Marcion's activity, Luke's Gospel existed in the collections of apostolic writings used in the churches, and to compel criticism to assign to this writing both ancient authority and a very early origin. Now this is just what the rationalistic school was not disposed to admit.† Consequently, Semler and Eichhorn in the past century, and, with still greater emphasis, Ritschl, Baur, and Schwegler in our time, have maintained that the priority belonged to the Gospel of Marcion, that this work was the true primitive Luke, and that our canonical Luke was the result of a retouch-

* Lipsius, "Die Zeit des Marcion und des Heracleon," in Hilgenfeld's "Zeitschr." 1867.

† Hilgenfeld himself points out the purely dogmatic origin of this rationalistic opinion: "This opinion," he says, "has misapprehended the true tendency of the Gospel of Marcion, *through a desire to assign to the canonical text* (to our Luke) *the most recent date possible*" ("Die Evangelien," p. 27).

ing of this more ancient work, accomplished in the second century in the sense of a modified Paulinism. We must do justice, however, to this critical school. No one has labored more energetically to rectify this erroneous opinion, tentatively brought forward by several of its adherents. Hilgenfeld, and above all Volkmar, have successfully combated it, and Ritschl has expressly withdrawn it ("Theol. Jahrb. X.," p. 528, *et seq.*); Bleek ("Einl. in. d. N. T.," p. 122 *et seq.*) has given an able summary of the whole discussion. We shall only bring forward the following points, which seem to us the most essential:

1. The greater part of the differences which must have distinguished the Gospel of Marcion from our Luke are to be explained either as the result of his Gnostic system, or as mere critical corrections. Thus, Marcion suppressed the first two chapters on the *birth* of Jesus—a retrenchment which suited his Docetism; also in the passage Luke 13 : 28, "When you shall see *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets* in the kingdom of God," he read, "When you shall see *the just* enter into the kingdom of heaven," which alone answered to his theory of the old covenant; in the same way also, for the words of Jesus in Luke 16 : 17, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle *of the law* to fail," Marcion read, "than that one tittle of the letter *of my words* should fail." In both these instances, one must be blind not to see that it was Marcion who modified the text of Luke to suit his system, and not the reverse. Again, we read that the Gospel of Marcion began in this way: "In the fifteenth year of the reign of the Emperor Tiberius, Jesus descended to Capernaum" (naturally, from heaven, without having passed through the human stages of birth and youth); then came the narrative of the first sojourn at Capernaum, just as it is related Luke 4 : 31 *et seq.;* and after that, only in the inverse order to that which obtains in our Gospel, the narrative of the visit to Nazareth, Luke 4 : 16 *et seq.* Is it not clear that such a beginning could not belong to the primitive writing, and that the transposition of the two narratives which follow was designed to do away with the difficulty presented by the words of the inhabitants of Nazareth (Luke 4 : 23), as Luke places them, *before* the sojourn at Capernaum? The narrative of Marcion was then the result of a dogmatic and critical revision of Luke 3 : 1, 4 : 31, 4 : 16 and 23.

2. It is a well-known fact that Marcion had falsified the Epistles of Paul by an exactly similar process.

3. Marcion's sect *alone* availed themselves of the Gospel used by this heretic. This fact proves that this work was not an evangelical writing already known, which the author of our Luke modified, and which Marcion alone had preserved intact.

From all this, a scientific criticism can only conclude that our Gospel of Luke was in existence before that of Marcion, and that this heretic chose this among all the Gospels which enter into the ecclesiastical collection as the one which he could most readily adapt to his system.* About 140, then, our Gospel already possessed full authority, the result of a conviction of its apostolic origin.

* Zeller (in his "Apostelgeschichte") expresses himself thus: "We may admit as proved and generally accepted, not only that Marcion made use of an older Gospel, but further, that he recomposed, modified, and often abridged it, and that this older Gospel was essentially none other than our Luke." This restriction "essentially" refers to certain passages, in which it appears to writers of the Tübingen school that Marcion's reading is more original than that of our canonical text. The latter, according to Baur and Hilgenfeld, must have been introduced with a view to counteract the use which the Gnostics made of the true text. Zeller, however (p. 12 *et seq.*),

Marcion did not create his system himself. Before him, Cerdo, according to Theodoret's account ("Hæret. fabulæ," i. 24), proved *by the Gospels* that the *just* God of the old covenant and the *good* God of the new are different beings ; and he founded this contrariety on the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5 : 38–48 ; Luke 6 : 27–38). The Gospel of Luke must have sustained the principal part in this demonstration, if at least we credit the testimony of an ancient writer (Pseudo-Tertullian, in the conclusion of the "De præscriptione hæreticorum," c. 51) : "*Solum evangelium Lucæ, nec tamen totum, recipit* [Cerdo]." Some years, then, before Marcion, Cerdo sought to prove the opposition of the law to the Gospel by the *written Gospels*, especially by that of Luke.

Basilides, one of the most ancient known Gnostics, who is usually said to have flourished at Alexandria about 120, assumed for himself and his son Isidore the title of pupils of the Apostle Matthias. The statement of Hippolytus is as follows : "Basilides, with Isidore, his true son and disciple, said that Matthias had transmitted to them orally some secret instructions which he had received from the mouth of the Saviour in His private teaching." * This claim of Basilides implies the circulation of the book of the Acts, in which alone there is any mention of the apostolate of Matthias, and consequently of the Gospel of Luke, which was composed before the Acts.

2. The Fathers.—*Justin, Pōlycarp, Clement of Rome.*

If it is proved that about 140, and at Rome, Cerdo and Marcion made use of the Gospel of Luke as a book generally received in the Church, it is quite impossible to suppose that this Gospel was not in the hands of Justin, who wrote in this very city some years later. Besides, the writings of Justin allow of no doubt as to this fact ; and it is admitted at the present day by all the writers of that school, which makes exclusive claims to be *critical*—by Zeller, Volkmar, and Hilgenfeld.† With this

considerably reduces the number of those passages in which Marcion is supposed to have preserved the true reading, and those which he retains are far from bearing the marks of proof. Thus, Luke 10 : 22, Marcion appears to have read *οὐδεὶς ἔγνω*, no one *hath known*, instead of *οὐδεὶς γινώσκει*, no one knoweth ; and because this reading is found in Justin, in the "Clementine Homilies," and in some of the Fathers, it is inferred that our canonical text has been altered. But Justin himself also reads *γινώσκει* ("Dial, c. Tryph." c. 100). There appears to be nothing more here than an ancient variation. In the same passage, Marcion appears to have placed the words which refer to the knowledge of the Father by the Son before those which refer to the knowledge of the Son by the Father—a reading which is also found in the "Clementine Homilies." But here, again, this can only be a mere variation of reading which it is easy to explain. It is of such little dogmatic importance that Irenæus, who opposes it critically, himself quotes the passage twice in this form ("Tischend. ad Matth. 11 : 27").

* "S. Hippolyti Refutationis omnium hæresium librorum decem quæ super sunt" (ed. Duncker et Schneidewin), L. vii. § 20.

† "Justin's acquaintance with the Gospel of Luke is demonstrated by a series of passages, of which some *certainly*, and others *very probably*, are citations from this book" (Zeller, "Apostelgeschichte," p. 26). On the subject of a passage from the "Dialogue with Trypho," c. 49, Volkmar says : "Luke (3 : 16, 17) is quoted here, first in common with Matthew, then, in preference to the latter, *literally*" ("Ursprung unserer Ev." p. 157). "Justin is acquainted with our three synoptical Gospels, and extracts them almost completely" (Ibid. p. 91). "Besides Matthew and Mark . . . Justin also makes use of the Gospel of Luke" (Hilgenfeld, "Der Kanon," p. 25).

admission before us, we know what the assertions of M. Nicolas are worth, which he does not scruple to lay before French readers, who have so little acquaintance with questions of this nature—such an assertion, for instance, as this : "It is impossible to read the comparisons which critics of this school [the orthodox] are accustomed to make between certain passages of Polycarp, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and *even Justin Martyr*, and analogous passages from our Gospels, without being tempted to think that the cause must be very bad that can need, or that can be satisfied with such arguments."* It appears that Messrs. Zeller, Hilgenfeld, and Volkmar are all implicated together in furbishing up these fallacious arguments in favor of orthodoxy ! Here are some passages which prove unanswerably that Justin Martyr used our third Gospel : Dial. c. 100, he quotes almost *verbatim* Luke 1 : 26-30.† Ibid. c. 48, and Apol. i. 34, he mentions the census of Quirinus in the very terms of Luke. Dial. c. 41 and 70, and Apol. i. 66, he refers to the institution of the Holy Supper according to the text of Luke. Dial. c. 103, he says : "In the memoirs which I say were composed by His apostles, and by those that accompanied them, [it is related] that the sweat rolled from Him in drops while He prayed," etc. (Luke 22 : 44). Ibid., Justin refers to Jesus having been sent to Herod—an incident only related by Luke. Ibid. c. 105, he quotes the last words of Jesus, "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit," as taken from "The Memoirs of the Apostles." ‡ This prayer is only recorded by Luke (23 : 46). We have only indicated the quotations expressly acknowledged as such by Zeller himself ("Apostelgeschichte," pp. 26–37).

It is impossible, then, to doubt that the Gospel of Luke formed part of those *apostolic memoirs* quoted eighteen times by Justin, and from which he has derived the greater part of the facts of the Gospel that are mentioned by him.

The Acts of the Apostles having been written after the Gospel, and by the same author (these two facts are admitted by all true criticism), every passage of the Fathers which proves the existence of this book at a given moment demonstrates *à fortiori* the existence of the Gospel at the same time. We may therefore adduce the following passage from Polycarp, which we think can only be explained as a quotation from the Acts :

Acts 2 : 24.	Polyc. *ad Phil.* c. 1.
Ὃν ὁ Θεὸς ἀνέστησεν, λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου.	Ὃν ἤγειρεν ὁ Θεὸς λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ ᾅδου.
"Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the [birth-] pains of death."	"Whom God hath awakened, having loosed the [birth-] pains of Hades."

The identical construction of the proposition in the two writings, the choice of the term λύσας, and the strange expression *the birth-pains of death* (Acts) or *of Hades* (Polyc.), scarcely permit us to doubt that the passage in Polycarp was taken from that in the Acts.§

* "Etudes critiques sur le N. T." p. 5.

† Reference to Justin Martyr's "Dialogues" (Clarke's edition), p. 225, will show that vv. 26–38 are quoted in the way in which one who wished to summarize would reproduce.—J. H.

‡ So called in c. 100, when quoting from Matt. 4 : 9, 10.—J. H.

§ It is not impossible, certainly, that the expression ὠδῖνες was taken by both these authors from Ps. 18 : 5, or from Ps. 116 : 3, where the LXX. translate by this term the word חֶבֶל, which signifies at once *bonds* and *pains of childbirth* ; but there still remains in the two propositions as a whole an unaccountable similarity.

In the Epistle of Clement of Rome there is an exhortation beginning with these words : "Remember the words of the Lord Jesus, in which he taught equity and generosity ;" then comes a passage in which the texts of Matthew and Luke in the Sermon on the Mount appear to be combined, but where, in the opinion of Volkmar,* the text of Luke predominates (6 : 31, 36-38). In this same letter the Acts are twice quoted, first at c. 18, where mention is made of a divine testimony respecting King David, and there is an amalgamation of the two following Old Testament passages : 1 Sam. 13 : 14 and Ps. 89 : 21. Now a precisely similar fusion, or very nearly so, is found in the book of the Acts (13 : 22). How could this almost identical combination of two such distinct passages of the Old Testament have occurred spontaneously to the two writers?

1 Sam. 13 : 14.	Ps. 89 : 20.
"The Lord hath sought him *a man after his own heart.*"	"*I have found David* my servant ; with my holy oil have I anointed him."

Acts 13 : 22.

"*I have found David* the son of Jesse, *a man after mine own heart,* which shall fulfil all my will."

Clem. *Ep. ad Cor.* c. 18.

"*I have found a man after my own heart, David* son of Jesse ; and I have anointed him with eternal oil."

The other quotation is an expression of euolgy which Clement addresses to the Corinthians (c. 2) : "Giving more willingly than receiving (*μᾶλλον δίδοντες ἢ λαμβάνοντες*),"—a repetition of the very words of Jesus cited by Paul, Acts 20 : 35 : "It is more blessed to give than to receive (*διδόναι μᾶλλον ἢ λαμβάνειν*)." No doubt these are allusions rather than quotations properly so called. But we know that this is the ordinary mode of quotation in the Fathers.

It is true that the Tübingen school denies the authenticity of the Epistles of Clement and Polycarp, and assigns them, the former to the first quarter, and the latter to the second part, of the second century ; but the authenticity of the former in particular is guaranteed by the most unexceptionable testimonies. Although in many respects not at all flattering to the church of Corinth, it was deposited in the archives of this church, and, according to the testimony of Dionysius, bishop of Cornith about 170, was frequently read publicly to the congregation. Further, it is quoted by Polycarp, Hegesippus, and Irenæus. Now, if it is authentic, it dates, not from 125, as Volkmar thinks, but at latest from the end of the first century. According to Hase, it belongs to between 80 and 90 ; according to Tischendorf, it dates from 69, or, less probably, from 96. For our part, we should regard this last date as most probable. In any case, we see that the use of Luke's writings in this letter confers a very high antiquity on their diffusion and authority.

3. The Pseudepigraphical Writings.—*Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.*

Among the writings of Jewish or Jewish-Christian origin which antiquity has bequeathed to us, there is one which appears to have been composed by a Christian

* "The text of Matthew differs most, while Luke's text furnishes the substance of the developed thought" ("Urspr.," p. 138).

Jew, desirous of bringing his fellow-countrymen to the Christian faith. With this view he represents the twelve sons of Jacob as speaking on their death-beds, and assigns to each of them a prophetic discourse, in which they depict the future lot of their people, and announce the blessings to be conferred by the gospel. Contrary to the opinion of M. Reuss, who places the composition of this work after the middle of the second century,* de Groot and Langen think that it belongs to the end of the first or the beginning of the second.† As this book alludes to the first destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in 70, but in no way refers to the second by Adrian in 135, it must, it would seem, date from the interval between these two events. It contains numerous quotations from Luke as well as from the other evangelists, but the following passage is particularly important: "In the last days, said Benjamin to his sons, there shall spring from my race a ruler according to the Lord, who, after having heard his voice, shall spread a new light among the heathen. He shall abide in the synagogues of the heathen to the end of the ages, and shall be in the mouth of their chiefs as a pleasant song. *His work and his word shall be written in the holy books.* He shall be chosen of God for eternity. My father Jacob hath told me about him who is to make up for the deficiencies of my race." The Apostle Paul was of the tribe of Benjamin, and there is an allusion in this passage to his work as described in the book of the Acts, and probably also to his epistles as containing his word. There is no doubt, then, that the book of the Acts is here referred to as constituting part of the collection of holy books (ἐν βίβλοις ταῖς ἁγίαις). This passage is thus the parallel of the famous *As it is written*, which is found in the Epistle of Barnabas, and which serves as a preamble, about the same time, to a quotation from the Gospel of St. Matthew.‡ Before the end of the first century, therefore, there were collections of apostolic writings in the churches, the contents of which we cannot exactly describe: they varied, no doubt, in different churches, which were already regarded equally with the Old Testament *as holy;* and in these, the book of the Acts, and consequently the Gospel of Luke, found a place.

4. Biblical Writings.—*John, Mark, Acts.*

The whole Gospel of John supposes, as we think has been proved in our *Commentary* upon that book, the existence of our synoptics, and their propagation in the Church. As to Luke in particular, 10 : 38–42 must be compared with John 11 and 12 : 1–8; then 24 : 1–12 and 36–49 with John 20 : 1–18 and 19–23, where John's narrative appears to allude, sometimes even in expression, to Luke's.

The first distinct and indubitable trace of the influence of Luke's Gospel on a book of the New Testament is found in the conclusion of Mark (16 : 9–20). On the one hand, we hope to prove that, until we come to this fragment, the composition of Mark is quite independent of Luke's narrative. On the other hand, it is evident that from this point the narrative of Mark, notwithstanding some peculiarities, is scarcely

* "Die Gesch. der heil. Schr. N. T.," § 257.

† De Groot, "Basilides," p 37; Langen, "Das Judenthum in Palesti," 148.

‡ Hilgenfeld, with all fairness, acknowledges this quotation in the Epistle of Barnabas and the consequences deducible from it: "We meet with the first trace of this application [of the notion of inspiration as in the writings of the Old Testament to those of the apostles] at the close of the first century, in the so-called letter of Barnabas, in which a sentence from the Gospel is quoted as a passage of Scripture" ("Der Kanon," p. 10).

P. J. LIBRARY K. C. K.

anything but an abridged reproduction of Luke's. It is, as it has been called, *the most clearly marked style of extract.* Compare verse 9*b* and Luke 8 : 2 ; verses 10, 11, and Luke 24 : 10–12 ; verse 12 and Luke verses 13–22 ; verse 13, and Luke verses 33–35 ; verse 14*a* and Luke verses 36–43. It is possible also that John 20 : 1–17 may have had some influence on verse 9*a*. As to the discourse verses 15–18, and the fragment verses 19, 20, the author of this conclusion must have taken these from materials of his own. Now we know that this conclusion to Mark, from 16 : 9, was wanting, according to the statements of the Fathers, in a great many ancient MSS.; that it is not found at the present day in either of the two most ancient documents, the *Sinaitic* or *Vatican ;* that the earliest trace of it occurs in Irenæus ; and that an entirely different conclusion, bearing, however, much more evidently the impress of a later ecclesiastical style, is the reading of some other documents. If, then, the conclusion found in the received text is not from the hand of the author, still it is earlier than the middle of the second century. We must also admit that no considerable interval could have elapsed between the composition of the Gospel and the composition of this conclusion ; for the discourse, verse 15 *et seq.* is too original to be a mere compilation : further, it must have been drawn up from materials dating from the time of the composition of the Gospel ; and the remarkable agreement which exists between the ending, verses 19 and 20, and the general thought of the book, proves that whoever composed this conclusion had fully entered into the mind of the author. The latter must have been suddenly interrupted in his work ; for 16 : 8 could never have been the *intended* conclusion of his narrative. An appearance of Jesus in Galilee is announced (5 : 1–8), and the narrative ought to finish without giving an account of this. Besides, verse 9 is quite a fresh beginning, for there is an evident break of connection between this verse and verse 8.

From all these considerations, it follows that at verse 8 the work was suddenly suspended, and that a short time after, a writer, who was still in the current of the author's thought, and who might have had the advantage of some materials prepared by him, drew up this conclusion. Now, if up to 16 : 8 the Gospel of Luke has exercised no influence on Mark's work, and if, on the contrary, from 16 : 9 there is a perceptible influence of the former on the latter, there is only one inference to be drawn —namely, that the Gospel of Luke appeared in the interval between the composition of Mark and the writing of its conclusion. In order, then, to fix the date of the publication of our Gospel, it becomes important to know by what circumstance the author of the second Gospel was interrupted in his work. The only probable explanation of this fact, as it appears to us, is the unexpected outbreak of Nero's persecution in August, 64, just the time when Mark was at Rome with Peter. At the request of the faithful belonging to this church, he had undertaken to write the narratives of this apostle, in other words, the composition of our second Gospel. The persecution which broke out, and the violent death of his master, probably forced him to take precipitous flight from the capital. It is only necessary to suppose that a copy of the yet unfinished work remained in the hands of some Roman Christian, and was deposited in the archives of his church, to explain how the Gospel at first got into circulation in its incomplete form. When, a little while after, some one set to work to complete it, the Gospel of Luke had appeared, and was consulted. The work, finished by help of Luke's Gospel, was copied and circulated in this new form. In this way the existence of the two kinds of copies is explained. The year 64 would then be the *terminus a quo* of the publication of Luke. On the other hand, the writing

of the conclusion of Mark must have preceded the publication, or at least the diffusion, of the Gospel of Matthew. Otherwise the continuator of Mark would certainly have given it the preference, because its narrative bears an infinitely closer resemblance than Luke's to the account he was completing. The composition of the canonical conclusion of Mark would then be prior to the diffusion of our Matthew, and consequently before the close of the first century, when this writing was already clothed with a divine authority equal to that of the Old Testament (p. 11). Now, since the conclusion of Mark implies the existence of the Gospel of Luke, we see to what a high antiquity these facts, when taken together, oblige us to refer the composition of the latter.

The other biblical writing which presents a point of connection with our Gospel is the book of the Acts. From its opening verses, this writing supposes the Gospel of Luke already composed and known to its readers. When was the book of the Acts composed? From the fact that it terminates so suddenly with the mention of Paul's captivity at Rome (spring 62 to 64), it has often been concluded that events had proceeded just thus far at the time the work was composed. This conclusion, it is true, is hasty, for it may have been the author's intention only to carry his story as far as the apostle's arrival at Rome. His book was not intended to be a biography of the apostles generally, nor of Peter and Paul in particular; it was the work that was important to him, not the workmen. Nevertheless, when we observe the fulness of the narrative, especially in the latter parts of the work; when we see the author relating the minutest details of the tempest and Paul's shipwreck (27), and mentioning even the sign of the ship which carried the apostle to Italy (28 : 11)—"A ship of Alexandria, whose sign was *Castor and Pollux*")—it cannot be reasonably maintained that it was a rigorous adherence to his plan which prevented his giving his readers some details respecting the end of this ministry, and the martyrdom of his master. Or might he have proposed to make this the subject of a third work? Had he a mind to compose a trilogy, after the fashion of the Greek tragedians? The idea of a third work might no doubt be suggested to him afterward by subsequent events; and this appears to be the sense of certain obscure words in the famous fragment of Muratori. But it is not very probable that such an intention could have determined his original plan, and influenced the composition of his two former works. What matter could appear to the author of sufficient importance to be placed on a level, as the subject of a τρίτος λόγος, with the contents of the Gospel or the Acts? Or, lastly, was it the premature death of the author which came and put an end to his labor? There is no ground for this supposition. The conclusion, Acts 28 : 30 and 31, while resembling analogous conclusions at the end of each narrative in the Gospel and in the Acts, has rather the effect of a *closing period* intentionally affixed to the entire book. We are then, in fact, brought back to the idea that Paul's career was not yet finished when the author of the Acts terminated his narrative, and wrote the last two verses of chap. 28; since, were this not the case, fidelity to his plan would in no way have prevented his giving some details on a subject so interesting to his readers. The book of the Acts, therefore, does not appear to have been written very long after the time which forms the termination of the narrative. This conclusion, if well founded, applies *à fortiori* to the Gospel of Luke.

To sum up: the use which was made of the third Gospel at Rome, in the middle of the second century, by Justin, Marcion, and his master Cerdo, and the apostolic authority implied in the diffusion of this work, and in the respect it enjoyed at this

period, oblige us to admit its existence as early as the beginning of this century. A very recent book could not have been known and used thus simultaneously in the Church and by the sects. The place which the Acts held in collections of the sacred writings at the epoch of the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" (toward the end of the first or the commencement of the second century), sends us back a little further, to about 80–100. Lastly, the relations of the third Gospel to Mark and the Acts carry us to an epoch still more remote, even as far back as the period from 64 to 80.

An objection to this result has been found in the silence of Papias—a silence which Hilgenfeld has even thought an indication of positive rejection on the part of this Father. But because Eusebius has only preserved the information furnished by Papias respecting the composition of Mark and Matthew—only a few lines altogether—it does not follow that Papias did not know Luke, or that, if he knew, he rejected him. All that can reasonably be inferred from this silence is, that Eusebius had not found anything of interest in Papias as to the origin of Luke's book. And what is there surprising in that? Matthew and Mark had commenced their narratives without giving the smallest detail respecting the composition of their books; Luke, on the contrary, in his preface, had told his readers all they needed to know. There was no tradition, then, current on this point, and so Papais had found nothing new to add to the information given by the author.

We ought to say, in concluding this review, that we do not attach a decisive value to the facts we have just noticed, and that among the results arrived at there are several which we are quite aware are not indisputable.* Nevertheless, it has appeared to us that there were some interesting coincidences (*points de repère*) which a careful study of the subject should not overlook. The only fact which appears to us absolutely decisive is the ecclesiastical and liturgical use of our Gospel in the churches in the middle of the second century, as it is established by Justin. If this book really formed part of those "Memoirs of the Apostles," which he declared to the emperor were publicly read every Sunday in the Christian assemblies, the apostolic antiquity of this book must have been a fact of public notoriety, and all the more that it did not bear the name of an apostle at the head of it.

SEC. II.—THE AUTHOR.

Under this title are included two distinct questions: I. What do we know of the person designated in the title as the author of our Gospel? II. By what ecclesiastical testimonies is the composition of this book traced to him, and what is their worth?

I.

The person named *Luke* is only mentioned in certain passages of the New Testament, and in some few brief ecclesiastical traditions.

The biblical passages are: Col. 4 : 14, "Luke, the beloved physican, and Demas, greet you;" Philem. 24, "There salute thee Epaphras, my fellow-prisoner in Christ Jesus; Marcus, Aristarchus, Demas, Lucas, my fellow-laborers;" 2 Tim. 4 : 11. "Only Luke is with me."

* We ought to emphasize this reservation, in view of some reviews in which we have been blamed for dealing here too largely in hypothesis.

250

These passages, considered in their context, yield these results :

1. That Luke was a Christian of *Pagan* origin. This is proved beyond doubt in the first passage by the distinction between the group of Christians of *the circumcision* (verses 10, 11), and the following group to which Luke belongs (verses 12–14). The objection which has been taken to this exegetical inference, on the ground of an Aramæan tincture of style in many passages of Luke, has, so far as we can see, no force. Accordingly, St. Luke would be the only author, among those who were called to write the Scriptures, who was not of Jewish origin.

2. The circumstance that his profession was that of *a physician* is not unimportant ; for it implies that he must have possessed a certain amount of scientific knowledge, and belonged to the class of educated men. There existed at Rome, in the time of the emperors, a medical supervision ; a superior college (*Collegium archiatrorum*) was charged with the duty of examining in every city those who desired to practise the healing art. Newly admitted men were placed under the direction of older physicians ; their modes of treatment were strictly scrutinized, and their mistakes severely punished, sometimes by taking away their diploma.* For these reasons, Luke must have possessed an amount of scientific and literary culture above that of most of the other evangelists and apostles.

3. Luke was *the fellow-laborer* of Paul in his mission to the heathen, a fellow-laborer *greatly beloved* (Col. 4 : 14) and *faithful* (2 Tim. 4 : 9-12).

But here arises an important question. Does the connection which has just been proved between Paul and Luke date, as Bleek thinks, only from the apostle's sojourn at Rome—a city in which Luke had long been established as a physician, and where he had been converted by Paul? Or had Luke already become the companion of the apostle before his arrival at Rome, and had he taken part in his missionary toils in Greece or in Asia? The solution of this question depends on the way in which we regard a certain number of passages in the Acts, in which the author passes all at once from the third person, *they*, to the form of the first person, *we*. If it is admitted (1) that Luke is the author of the Acts (a question which we cannot yet deal with), and (2) that the author, in thus expressing himself, wishes to intimate that at certain times he shared the apostle's work, it is evident that our knowledge of his life will be considerably enriched by these passages. It is only this second question that we shall examine here.

The passages of which we speak are three in number : 16 : 10–17 ; 20 : 5–31, 17 ; 27 : 1–28, 16. Here several suppositions are possible : Either Luke, the author of the entire book, describes in the first person the scenes in which he was himself present ; or the author, either Luke or some Christian of the first age, inserts in his work such and such fragments of a traveller's journal kept by one of Paul's companions—by Timothy or Silas, for example ; or, lastly, a forger of later times, with a view to accredit his work and make it pass for Luke's, to whom he ventures to attribute it, introduces into it some fragments of Luke, changing their substance and remodelling their form, but purposely allowing the first person to stand in these portions. The first supposition is the one that has been most generally admitted from ancient times ; the second has been maintained by Schleiermacher and Bleek, who attribute the journal, whence these portions are taken to Timothy ; also by Schwanbeck, who makes it the work of Silas ; the third is the hypothesis defended by Zeller.

* Tholuck, "Die Glaubwürdigk. der ev. Gesch." p. 149 (according to Galen).

If the first explanation is the most ancient, it is because it is that which most naturally occurs to the mind. After the author, at the beginning of his book, had made use of the first person, "The former treatise *have I made*, O Theophilus," would it not be evident to his readers that when, in the course of the narrative, he came to say *we* it was with the intention of indicating himself as a witness of the facts related? If he had borrowed these fragments from the journal of another, why did he not assimilate them in form to the rest of the narrative? Surely it was not difficult for such a writer as he was to change the first person into the third. It is maintained that the author is an unskilled writer, who does not know how to work up his materials; but Zeller rightly replies that the unity of style, aim, and method which prevails throughout the book of the Acts, proves, on the contrary, that the author has made very skilful use of the documents at his disposal. De Wette himself, although a supporter of Schleiermacher's theory, is obliged to acknowledge this. And if this is so, it is impossible to explain how the author could have allowed this *we* to stand. Besides, this explanation has to contend with other difficulties. If this pronoun *we* emanates from the pen of Timothy, how is it that it does not come in at the moment when Timothy enters on the scene and joins Paul and Silas? How is it, again, that it suddenly disappears, although Timothy continues the journey with Paul (from his departure from Philippi and during his entire stay in Achaia, Acts 18; comp, with 1 and 2 Thess. 1 : 1)? Above all, how is it that this *we* is resumed, 20 : 5, in a passage in which the writer who thus designates himself is *expressly opposed* to a number of persons, *among whom figures Timothy?* Bleek tries to draw out of this difficulty by applying the pronoun οὗτοι, *these*, verse 5, simply to the last two of the persons mentioned, Tychicus and Trophimus. But every one must feel that this is a forced explanation. As Zeller says, had this been the case, it would have been necessary to have said οὗτοι οἱ δύο, *these two*.

The same and even greater difficulties prevent our thinking of Silas, since, according to the Epistles, after their stay at Corinth, this missionary no longer appears in company with Paul, yet the *we* goes on to the end of the Acts. As to the opinion of Zeller, it makes the author an impostor, who determined to assume the mask of Luke in order the more easily to obtain credence for his history. But whence comes the unanimous tradition which attributes the Gospel and the Acts to Luke, when he is never once *named* in these works as their author? In order to explain this fact, Zeller is obliged to have recourse to a fresh hypothesis, that the forger in the first instance had inscribed Luke's name at the head of his work, and that afterward, by some unknown accident, the name was dropped, although the Church had fallen completely into the snare. Can a more improbable supposition be imagined? The ancient explanation, which is that of common-sense, is, after all these fruitless attempts, the only one scientifically admissible: the author of the Acts employed the pronoun *we* in every case in which he himself was present at the scenes described.

To this exegetical conclusion only two objections of any value have been offered: 1. The sudden character of the appearance and disappearance of the pronoun *we* in the narrative. A companion of Paul, it is said, would have indicated how it was he happened to be with the apostle, and why he left him. 2. Schleiermacher asks how a new-comer, converted only yesterday, could have expressed himself with so little modesty as: "immediately *we* endeavored . . .; the Lord had called *us* . . ." (Acts 16 : 10). But how do we know that the author had not been for a long while

connected with the apostle when he met with him at Troas (see Sec. 3)? Besides, was not Timothy himself also quite a recent convert? That the writer does not explain the circumstances which led to his meetings with Paul and his partings from him, is in accordance with that modest reticence observed by the sacred writers whenever they themselves are concerned. They avoid, with a kind of shame, whatever might direct the attention of the reader to themselves. Obliged by fidelity to truth to indicate his presence wherever he formed part of the missionary company, the author could not do this in a more natural and modest way than that which dispenses with his naming himself.*

On the supposition that Luke is the author of the Acts, we may supplement what we know about him by the information supplied by those passages in which the *we* is employed. At Troas, where he was when Paul, whom he had known perhaps long before (p. 21), arrived there, he joined the three missionaries, and passed with them into Europe. He remained at Philippi, the first church founded on this continent, when persecution obliged his three companions to leave the city. For the *we* ceases from this moment. Since this pronoun only reappears when Paul again comes to Philippi, at the end of his third journey (20 : 5), it follows that Luke remained attached to this church during the second and third missionary journey of the apostle, and that then he rejoined him in order to accompany him to Jerusalem. And as the *we* is continued to the end of the book (the interruption, 21 : 17, 26 : 32, not being really such), Luke must have remained in Palestine with the apostle during the time of his imprisonment in Cæsarea. This explains the expression (27 : 1) : "And when it was determined *we should sail* into Italy." Luke, therefore, with Aristarchus (26 : 2), was Paul's companion in his journey to Rome. According to the Epistles, from that time to the end, save during those temporary absences when he was called away in the service of the gospel, he faithfully shared Paul's sufferings and toil.

Before leaving the domain of Scripture, we must mention an ingenious conjecture, due to Thiersch, which appears to us open to no substantial objection. From these words, "Only Luke is with me" (2 Tim. 4 : 11), compared with what follows almost immediately (ver. 13), "Bring with thee the books, and especially the parchments," this writer has concluded that at the time Paul thus wrote he was occupied in some literary labor for which these manuscripts were required. In this case it must also be admitted that Luke, who was alone with him at the time, was not unacquainted with this labor, if even it was not his own.

These results obtained from Scripture fit in without difficulty with a piece of information supplied by the Fathers. Eusebius and Jerome† tell us that Luke was

* Bleek objects, further, that Luke is not mentioned in the Epistles to the Thessalonians, the Corinthians, and the Philippians. But if Luke remained at Philippi, why should he be mentioned in the letters to the Thessalonians, which were written from Achaia a little later? If he is not *named* in the Epistles to the Cornithians, he appears at least to be referred to as one of the most eminent of the evangelists of Greece, 2 Cor. 8 : 18 and 22 (though it is not certain that this passage refers to him). And what necessity was there that he should be named in these letters? As to the Epistle to the Philippians, at the time when Paul wrote it, it might very well happen that Luke was neither at Rome nor Philippi. To Bleek's other objection, that the author of the Acts reckons according to the Jewish calendar, which does not suit a writer of heathen origin, Zeller rightly replies that "in the case of a companion of Paul, this was just the only natural mode of reckoning."

† "Hist. Eccl. iii. 4; "De vir. illustr." c. 7.

originally from Antioch. Meyer and De Wette see in this nothing but an exegetical conclusion, drawn from Acts 13 : 1, where mention is made of one Lucius exercising his ministry in the church at Antioch. But this supposition does very little honor to the discernment of these Fathers, since in this very passage Lucius is described as originally from Cyrene in Africa. Besides, the name Lucius (from the root *lux*, *lucere*) has quite a different etymology from Lucas, which is an abbreviation from Lucanus (as Silas from Silvanus, etc.). If Luke had really found a home at Antioch, we can understand the marked predilection with which the foundation of the church in that city is related in the Acts. In the lines devoted to this fact (11 : 20–24) there is a spirit, animation, and freshness which reveal the charm of delightful recollections. And in this way we easily understand the manner in which the scene at Troas is described (16 : 10). Paul and the Gospel were old acquaintances to Luke when he joined the apostle at Troas.

We cannot, on the other hand, allow any value to the statement of Origen and Epiphanius, who reckon Luke in the number of the seventy disciples ; this opinion is contrary to the declaration of Luke himself, 1 : 2. Could Luke be, according to the opinion referred to by Theophylact, that one of the two disciples of Emmaus whose name is not recorded ? This opinion appears to be a conjecture rather than a tradition. The historian Nicephorus Kallistus (fourteenth century) makes Luke the painter who transmitted to the church the portraits of Jesus and His mother. This information rests, perhaps, as Bleek presumes, on a confusion of our evangelist with some ancient painter of the same name.* We know absolutely nothing certain respecting the latter part of his life. The passage in Jerome, found in some old editions of the De viris, according to which Luke lived a celibate to the age of eighty-four years, is not found in any ancient manuscript ; it is an interpolation. Gregory Nazianzen (Orat. iii. Advers. Julian.) is the first who confers on him the honor of martyrdom ; Nicephorus maintains that he was hanged on an olive-tree in Greece at the age of eighty years. These are just so many legends, the origin of which we have no means of ascertaining. It appears, however, that there was a widespread tradition that he ended his days in Achaia. For there, according to Jerome (De. vir. ill. c. 7), the Emperor Constantine sought for his ashes to transport them to Constantinople. Isidore maintains that they were brought from Bithynia.

Is this person really the author of our third Gospel and of the Acts ? We have to study the testimonies on which, historically speaking, this opinion rests.

II.

1. At the basis of all the particular testimonies we must place the general opinion of the Church as expressed in its title, "according to Luke." There was but one conviction on this point in the second century, from one extremity of the Church to the other, as we can still prove by the ancient versions in the Syriac and Latin tongues, the *Peschito* and the *Italic*. As to the meaning of the prep. κατά, *according to*, in this title, see the exegesis. We will only observe here, that if this preposition could bear the sense of "in the manner of, after the example of," in the case of Matthew and John, who were apostles, and therefore original authors of an evangelical tra-

* We can only cite as critical fancies the opinion of Kohlreif, which identifies Luke and Silas (*lucus* = *silva*), and that of Lange, who makes Luke the same person as the Aristion of Papias (*lucere* = ἀριστεύειν).

dition, this explanation becomes impossible when applied to Mark and Luke, who, since they never accompanied Jesus, could not assume the part of creators of a special tradition, but could only be designated compilers.

2. The first special testimony is implied in a passage of Justin Martyr, who, in reference to Jesus' sweat in Gethsemane, says :* " As that is related in the memoirs (*ἀπομνημονεύματα*), which I say were composed by His apostles and by their companions." It appears to us indisputable (although criticism has sought other interpretations), that among those books which Justin possessed, and of which he speaks elsewhere as " the memoirs which are called Gospels," there must have been, according to this passage, at least two Gospels emanating from apostles, and two proceeding from coadjutors of the apostles. And as the incident to which this Father here alludes is only recorded in Luke, Justin regarded the author of this book as one of the men who had accompanied the apostles.

3. In the fragment ascribed to Muratori, written about 180, and containing the tradition of the churches of Italy respecting the books of the New Testament, we read as follows : " Thirdly, the book of the Gospel according to St. Luke. This Luke, a physician, when Paul, after the ascension of Christ, had received him among his followers as a person zealous for righteousness (*juris studiosum*), wrote in his own name and according to his own judgment (*ex opinione*). Neither, again, had he himself seen the Lord in the flesh. Carrying his narrative as far back as he could obtain information (*prout assequi potuit*), he commenced with the birth of John." After having spoken of the Gospel of John, the author passes on to the Acts : " The Acts of all the Apostles," he says, " are written in a single book. Luke has included in it, for the excellent Theophilus, all that took place in his presence ; as also he clearly points out in a separate form (*semotè*) not only the suffering of Peter, but further, Paul's departure from Rome for Spain."

With the exception of the name of Luke, which is derived from the tradition received throughout the entire Church, this testimony respecting the Gospel seems to us nothing more than a somewhat bold reproduction of the contents of Luke's preface, combined with the information supplied by Col. 4 : 14 as to his profession. " In his own name :" that is to say, in obedience to an inward impulse, on his own personal responsibility ; not in the name of an apostle or a church ; an allusion to " It hath appeared good to me also" (1 : 3). " According to his own judgment :" an allusion to the fact that his narrative was not that of an eye-witness, but in accordance with the opinion he had formed of the facts by help of tradition and his own researches (1 : 2). " Neither again" had he himself seen : any more than Mark, of whom the author of the fragment had just spoken. The expression, " as he could obtain information," refers to what Luke says of the care he had taken to go back as far as possible, and to narrate events in the best order. The term *juris studiosum* (which Hilgenfeld supposes to be the translation of *τοῦ δικαίου ζηλωτήν*, in the original Greek, which he admits) might also be translated, a man skilled in questions of legal right ; able, consequently, to make himself useful to Paul whenever he had to deal with the Roman tribunals. But the term *ζηλωτής* rather favors the sense we have given in our translation. If the passage relating to the Acts has been accurately rendered into Latin, or if the text of it has not been altered, we might infer from it that Luke had narrated, in a third work (*semotè*, separately), the subsequent

* " Dial. c. Tryph." c. 22.

history of Peter and Paul. In any case, the whole testimony is remarkable for its very sobriety. It does not show the slightest tendency, any more than the preface of the evangelist himself, to ascribe divine authority to this writing. On the contrary, the human aspect of the work comes out very strongly in these expressions: "in his own name, according to his judgment, as far as he was able to obtain information." Perhaps the author wished to contrast this entirely natural mode of composition with the widely different origin of the Gospel of John, which he describes directly afterward.

4. At the same period, Irenæus expresses himself thus respecting the third Gospel (Adv. Hær. iii. 1): "Luke, a companion of Paul, wrote in a book the gospel preached by the latter." Irenæus quotes from our Gospel more than eighty times. This testimony and the preceding are the first two in which Luke is indicated by name as the author of this book.

5. Tertullian, in his book "Against Marcion" (iv. 2), expresses himself thus: "Of the apostles, John and Matthew inspire our faith; of the coadjutors of the apostles, Luke and Mark confirm it." He reminds Marcion "that, not only in the churches founded by the apostles, but in all those which are united to them by the bond of the Christian mystery, this Gospel of Luke has been received without contradiction (*stare*) from the moment of its publication, while the greater part are not even acquainted with that of Marcion." He says, lastly (Ibid. iv. 5), "that several persons of his time have been accustomed to attribute Luke's work to Paul himself, as well as Mark's to Peter." He neither pronounces for nor against this opinion.

6. Origen, in a passage cited by Eusebius (H. E. vi. 25), expressed himself thus: "Thirdly, the Gospel according to Luke, cited approvingly (ἐπαινούμενον) by Paul" It appears from the whole passage that he alludes, on the one hand, to the expression *my Gospel*, employed three times by Paul (Rom. 2 : 16; 16 : 25; 2 Tim. 1 : 8); on the other, to the passage 2 Cor. 8 : 18, 19, which he applied to Luke.

7. Eusebius says (H. E. iii. 4): "It is maintained that it is of the Gospel according to Luke that Paul is accustomed to speak whenever he makes mention in his writings of *his Gospel*."

8. Jerome (De vir. ill. c. 7) also refers to this opinion, but attributes it to "some persons" only (*quidam suspicantur*).

We have three observations to make on these testimonies.

1. If they are somewhat late—it is only about A.D. 180 that Luke's name appears—we must observe, on the other hand, that they are not the expression of the individual opinion of the writers in whose works they occur, but appear incidentally as the expression of the ancient, unbroken, and undisputed conviction of the entire Church. These writers give expression to the fact as a matter of which no one was ignorant. They would not have dreamed of announcing it, unless some special circumstance had called for it. The ecclesiastical character, at once universal and hereditary, of these testimonies, even when they date only from the second century enable us to ascertain the conviction of the first. In fact, what prevailed then was not individual criticism, but tradition. Clement of Alexandria, after having quoted a passage from the "Gospel of the Egyptians" (Strom. iii. p. 465), immediately adds: "But we have not seen this passage in the four Gospels which have been transmitted to us (ἐν τοῖς παραδεδομένοις ἡμῖν τέσσαρσιν εὐαγγελίοις)." The Bishop Serapion having found, in the parish church of Rhodes, in Cilicia, a so-called Gospel of Peter, contain-

ing Gnostic sentiments, wrote a letter to those who made use of it, a portion of which has been preserved by Eusebius (H. E. vi. 12, ed. Lœmmer), and it ends with these words: "Knowing well that such writings have not been transmitted (*ὅτι τὰ τοιαῦτα [ψευδεπίγραφα] οὐ παρελάβομεν*)." The traditional origin of the convictions of the Church respecting the origin of the sacred writings is the only explanation of their stability and universality. An opinion formed upon individual criticism could never have had these characteristics. It is very remarkable that the tradition respecting our Gospel is not disowned even by the ecclesiastical parties most opposed to Paul. Irenæus (iii. 15) declares that the Ebionites made use of our Gospel, and we can prove it ourselves by the quotations from the writings of Luke which we find in the "Clementine Homilies" (ix. 22; xix. 2). The plot even of this religious romance is borrowed from the book of the Acts. Now, in order that parties so opposed to each other, as Marcion on the one hand and the Ebionites on the other, should agree in making use of our Gospel, the conviction of its antiquity and authority must have been very ancient and very firmly established (*stare*, Tert.). There is another fact more striking still. The only sect of the second century which appears to have expressly rejected the book of the Acts, that of the Severians, took no exception to the Gospel of Luke. These results perfectly agree with those to which we were led by the facts enumerated, Sec. 1. Thus the blank that exists between the first positive testimonies which we meet with in the second century and the apostolic age is filled up by fact.

2. It is important to observe the gradual change in the tradition which manifests itself during the course of the second and third centuries. The nearer we approach its original sources, the more sober the tradition. In the eyes of Justin, the author of our Gospel is simply a companion of the apostles. In the fragment of Muratori the same information reappears without amplification. Strictly speaking, Irenæus does not go beyond this; only he already aims to establish a connection between the writing of Luke and the preaching of Paul. Tertullian notices an opinion prevalent in his time which goes much farther—namely, that Paul himself was the author of this Gospel. Last of all, Origen distinctly declares that when Paul said *my Gospel*, he meant the Gospel of Luke. This progression is just what we want to enable us to verify the real historical character of the tradition in its primitive form. If the original information had been invented under the influence of the apologetic interest which moulded the tradition later on, would it not have begun where it ended?

3. The supposition that the name of Luke, which has been affixed to our Gospel, was merely an hypothesis of the Fathers, gives no explanation why they should have preferred a man so seldom named as Luke, instead of fixing their choice on one of those fellow-laborers of the apostle that were better known, such as Timothy, Silas, or Titus, whom modern criticism has thought of. The obscurity in which this personage would be veiled, if his name did not figure at the head of the writings which are attributed to him, is one of the best guarantees of the tradition which declares him the author of them. We do not see, then, what, in a historic point of view, could invalidate the force of the ecclesiastical testimony on this point; and we agree with Holtzmann ("Die synopt. Evang." p. 377), when he says that "this tradition is only to be rejected from the point where it proceeds to place the composition of our Gospel under the guarantee of Paul himself."

Three opinions have been put forth by modern criticism on the question under consideration.

1. An "anonymous Saxon," * while declaring that our Gospel is nothing but a tissue of falsehoods, a pamphlet composed out of hatred of Peter and the Twelve, boldly attributes it to Paul himself.

2. Hilgenfeld, Zeller, etc., think that this writing is the work of an unknown Christian at the beginning of the second century.

3. Most admit, in conformity with the traditional opinion, that the author is the Luke mentioned in Paul's Epistles. We only mention, to show that we have not forgotten it, the opinion of Mayerhoff, never adopted by any one else, and which was only the very logical consequence of Schleiermacher's on the portions in which *we* occurs in the book of the Acts—namely, that our Gospel, as well as these portions, should be attributed to Timothy.

SEC. III.—COMPOSITION OF THE THIRD GOSPEL.

We possess nothing from tradition but some scanty and uncertain information respecting the origin of our Gospel.

I. As to the time, the greater part of the critics are wrong in making Irenæus say that Luke wrote after the death (or the departure from Rome) of Peter and Paul (*post horum excessum*, iii. 1). This is a false conclusion drawn from the fact that Irenæus speaks of the Gospel of Luke after that of Mark, to which this chronological statement applies. The order in which this Father here speaks of the Gospels and their origin may be simply the order of these books in the canon, and in no way of the date of their composition. We find in this same Irenæus (iii. 9, 10) the following order: Matthew, Luke, Mark.

The only real traditional information which we possess on this point is that of Clement of Alexandria, who states it as a fact transmitted by the presbyters who have succeeded each other from the beginning (*ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνέκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων*), "that the Gospels containing the genealogies were written first (*προγεγράφθαι τῶι εὐαγγελίων τὰ περιεχοντα τὰς γενεαλογίας*)." Eus. Hist. Eccl. vi. 14. According to this, Matthew and Luke were composed before Mark. Further, since, according to this very Clement and these same authorities, Mark must have been composed at Rome during Peter's life, it follows that, according to the view embodied in this tradition, Luke was composed prior to the death of this apostle. The sober and original form of the former of these two traditions, the respectable authority on which it rests, the impossibility of its having been deduced from an exegetical combination, seeing that there is no logical connection between the criterion indicated (the presence of a genealogy) and the date which is assigned to it, seem to me to confer a much higher value on this ancient testimony than modern criticism generally accords to it.

The reasons for which so early a date of composition is rejected are purely internal. It is thought that the Gospel itself yields proofs of a later date than would be indicated by this tradition of Clement. Baur, who has fixed it the latest, places the composition after A.D. 130; Hilgenfeld, from 100 to 110; Zeller, at the commencement of the second century or earlier; Volkmar, about 100; Keim, about 90. The other critics, Meyer, De Wette, Bleek, Reuss, who come nearer in general to the traditional opinion, limit themselves to saying, after the fall of Jerusalem; Holtzmann, between 70 and 80, Tholuck, Guericke, Ebrard, before the fall of Jerusalem. In the

* "Die Evangelien, ihr Geist, ihre Verfasser und ihr Verhältniss zu einander," 1st ed. 1845; 2d, 1852

concluding dissertation we shall weigh the exegetical reasons for and against these different opinions. But it appears to us, that the facts mentioned (Sec. 1) already make it clear that every opinion which places the composition in the second century is historically untenable. The use which the continuator of Mark and Clement of Rome make of our Gospel, and the use which this same Clement and the author of the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" make of the Acts, render so late a date of composition quite impossible.

II. As to the place, we have only two hints, and we can form no critical judgment of their value. Jerome (De vir. ill. c. 7) says: "Luke, a physician, who composed his book in the countries of Achaia and Bœotia." On the other hand, in the *Peschito*, the title of our Gospel runs thus: "Gospel of Luke the Evangelist, which he published and preached in Greek (*quod protulit et evangelisavit græce*) in Alexandria the Great." The two statements are not necessarily contradictory. Luke may have composed his work in Greece and have published it in Alexandria, which was the great centre of the book-world at that time.

Criticism cannot certainly feel itself bound by such late and uncertain information. Hilgenfeld, who on this point differs least from tradition, places the composition in Achaia or Macedonia; Köstlin at Ephesus; the majority at Rome or in Italy. We shall discuss the question in concluding.

III. The author himself announces his aim in his preface. He wrote with the design of completing the Christian instruction of a man in high station, named Theophilus. This name could not denote a purely fictitious person, as Origen supposed, who was inclined to apply it to every Christian endowed with spiritual powers. Neither could the Jewish high priest Theophilus, of whom Josephus speaks, be intended (Antiq. xviii. 6. 3; xix. 6. 2), nor the Athenian of this name mentioned by Tacitus (Ann. ii. 55). The only traditional information we possess about this person is that found in the "Clementine Recognitions" (x. 71), about the middle of the second century: "So that Theophilus, who was at the head of all the men in power at the city (of Antioch), consecrated, under the name of a church, the great basilica (the palace) in which he resided." * According to this, Theophilus was a great lord residing in the capital of Syria. We have already referred to the reasons which lead us to think that Luke himself was originally from this city. Did he belong to the household of Theophilus? Had he been his slave, and then his freedman? Lobeck has remarked that the termination *as* was a contraction particularly frequent in the names of slaves.† Physicians appear to have frequently belonged to the class of slaves or freedmen.‡ If Luke, freed by Theophilus, practised as a physician at Antioch, and if he was brought to the faith at the time of the founding of the church in that city, he might very well have decided to accompany the apostle in his mission.

In this case he would have rejoined him at Troas, just as he was about to pass over into Europe; and there would no longer be anything surprising in the pronoun *we*, by which he assigns himself a place in the missionary company. On this supposition, also, we can understand why he should have dedicated his work to his old friend

* "Ita ut Theophilus, qui erat cunctis potentibus in civitate sublimior, domus suæ ingentem basilicam ecclesiæ nomine consecraret."

† Wolf's "Analecten, iii. 49;" comp. Tholuck, "Glaubwürd." p. 148.

‡ Quintilian, "Instit." vii. 2: Medicinam factitasse manumissum. Suet. Calig. c. 8: Mittocum eo ex servis me is medicum. Comp. Cic. pro Cluentio, c. 63; Seneca, "De Beneficiis," iii. 24. See Hug, "Einl." ii. p. 134.

and patron. This dedication does not mean, however, that the book was intended for Theophilus alone. Until the discovery of printing, the publication of a work was a very costly undertaking ; and authors were accustomed to dedicate their works to some high personage of their acquaintance, who could procure the writer an opportunity of reading his production in some select circle, and have the first copies prepared at his own expense. In this way he opened to the author the road to publicity. Whoever was obliging enough to undertake this responsibility was called the *patronus libri*. Such, doubtless, was the service which Theophilus was asked to render to Luke's work. In reality, Luke addressed himself, through the medium of this person, to all that part of the church to which Theophilus belonged, to the churches of the Greek world, and, in a certain sense, to the entire Church.

The object he had in view, according to the Fathers, was simply to make known the history of Jesus, more particularly to converts from the heathen. Modern criticism has found in the preface, and even in the narrative, indications of a more special design connected with the great movement of ecclesiastical polemics which it conceives occupied the first and second centuries. According to Baur ("Marcus Evang." p. 223, *et seq.*), the original Luke, of which Marcion has preserved a faithful impression, was intended to oppose the Jewish Christianity of the Twelve, as represented by the Gospel of Matthew in its original form. The author sought to depreciate the apostles in order to exalt Paul ; while our canonical Luke, which is a later version of this original Luke, was directed rather against the unbelieving and persecuting Judaism. The former part of this proposition has been reproduced and developed in still stronger terms by "the anonymous Saxon," who sees nothing in the third Gospel but a bitter pamphlet of the Apostle Paul against the Twelve, and more especially against Peter. M. Burnouf has made himself the advocate of this view in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*.* But even in the Tübingen school a protest has been raised against what have been called the "exaggerations" of Baur. Zeller finds no trace either in the Gospel or the Acts of this spirit of systematic depreciation of Peter and the Twelve. According to him, the author simply wishes to check excessive admiration for Peter, and to preserve Paul's place by the side of this apostle. With this aim, he guards himself from directly opposing the Christianity of the Twelve ; he simply places side by side with the views of the Jewish-Christian apostles those of Paul, which he endeavors, as far as possible, to exhibit as identical with the former. That in this attempt at reconciliation real history is sacrificed, appears evident to this critic. He accounts in this way for the fact that in this Gospel Jesus gives utterance alternately to particularist teaching (in the sense of the Twelve), and to universalist passages suited to the thought of Paul.

Volkmar combats this view. Nowhere in our Gospel, not even in the facts and discourses of the first two chapters, does he discover those particularist or Ebionitish elements, by means of which, according to Zeller, the author sought to win the confidence of the Jewish-Christian party. In his judgment, the Gospel of Luke is purely Pauline. In opposition to that fiery manifesto of apostolic Jewish-Christianity, the Apocalypse,† composed in A.D. 68, Mark, five years afterward, published his Gospel, the earliest in point of time, and written in the sense of a moderate Paulinism ; later still, Luke re-wrote this book, laying still greater emphasis on the principles of the apostle to the Gentiles. In all these suppositions the idea is, that Jesus speaks in the Gospel, not as He really spoke, but as it suits the evangelist to make Him speak.

* December, 1865. † See p. 25.—J. H.

All these opinions as to the aim of Luke's work are connected with the great question, suggested by Baur, of a fundamental difference of view between Paul and the Twelve, which is represented as the real starting-point of the development of the Church and of the entire Christian literature. This question, with which that of the origin of the Gospels is now inseparably connected, will be discussed in our concluding paragraphs.

SEC. IV.—SOURCES OF THE THIRD GOSPEL.

There is no room for an inquiry into the sources whence the author of a Gospel derived his knowledge of the facts which he transmits to us, except on two conditions: 1. That the evangelist is not regarded as an eye-witness of the facts related. Now this is a character which the author of the third Gospel expressly disclaims (1 : 2). 2. That we are not governed by that false notion of inspiration, according to which the sacred history was revealed and dictated to the evangelists by the Holy Spirit. As far as our third Gospel is concerned, this idea is altogether excluded by what the author says himself of the information he had to obtain to qualify himself to write his book (1 : 3).*

It is at once, then, the right and the duty of criticism to inquire from what sources the author derived the incidents which he records. This question, however, is immediately complicated with another and more general question, as to the relation between our three synoptics. For many regard it as probable, and even certain, that some one of our Gospels served as a source of information to the writer who composed another of them. It is not our intention to relate here the history of the discussion of this great theological and literary problem.† We do not even intend in this place to set forth the numerous and apparently contradictory facts which bring it up afresh after every attempted solution. In view of the exegetical work we have in hand, we shall here bring forward only two matters:

I. The *elements* of which criticism has availed itself in order to solve the problem.

II. The principal *systems* which it constructs at the present day by means of these elements.

I.

The factors which criticism has hitherto employed for the solution of the problem are four in number:

1. *Oral tradition* (παράδοσις), or the reproduction of the apostolic testimony, as they gave it when they founded the churches. This factor must have borne a very essential part in determining the form of the evangelical historical writings from their very commencement. Luke indicates its importance, 1 : 2. According to this expression, "even as they delivered them unto us," this tradition was the original source of the oral or written narratives which were circulated in the churches. It branched out into a thousand channels through the ministry of the evangelists (Eph 4 : 11 ; 2 Tim. 4 : 5). Gieseler, with his exquisite historical tact, was the first to bring out all the value of this fact as serving to explain the origin of the Gospels.‡

* The advocates of the theory of plenary inspiration would not regard this paragraph as a correct representation of their views. They would not regard the use of foregoing documents as incompatible with their views.—J. H.

† We refer our readers to the generally accurate account of M. Nicolas, "Etudes Critiques sur le N. T." pp. 45–85.

‡ "Historisch-kritischer Versuch über die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der Schriftlichen Evangelien," Leipzig, 1818.

2. Separate writings or memoirs (*ἀπομνημονεύματα*) on some feature or particular part of the Saviour's life, on a discourse or a miracle which an evangelist related, and which he or one of his hearers put in writing that it might not be forgotten; or, again, some private account preserved among their family papers by the persons more immediately interested in the evangelical drama: we may regard our Gospel as a collection of a number of such detached writings, pieced together by the hand of an editor. Carrying out this view, Schleiermacher made a very ingenious analysis of the Gospel of Luke in a little work * which was to be completed by a similar study of the Acts, but the second part never appeared. Thus this scholar thought he could discriminate, in the portion 9 : 51 ; 19 : 48, traces of two distinct writings, the first of which would be the journal of a companion of Jesus in His journey to the feast of dedication, the second the journal of another companion of Jesus when He went up to the feast of the Passover. The truth of this second means of explanation might be supported by the proper meaning of the word *ἀνατάξασθαι, to arrange in order*, 1 : 1, if only it were proved that the arrangement implied by this word refers to the documents, and not to the facts themselves.

Under this category of detached writings would have to be ranged also the various documents which several critics believe they have detected in Luke's work, on account of a kind of literary or dogmatic patchwork which they find in it. Thus Kuinöl, following Marsh, regarded the portion 9 : 51 ; 18 : 14 as a more ancient writing, containing a collection of the precepts of Jesus, to which he gave the name of gnomonology. Hilgenfeld † also distinguishes from the narrative as a whole, which has the universalist character of the Christianity of St. Paul, certain passages of Jewish-Christian tendency, which he regards as some very early materials, proceeding from the apostolic Church itself. The entire portion 9 : 51 ; 19 : 28 rests, according to him, on a more ancient writing which the author introduced into his work, working it up afresh both in substance and form. Köstlin ‡ thinks it may be proved that there were some sources of Judean origin, and others of Samaritan origin, which furnished Luke with a knowledge of the facts of which the two countries of Judea and Samaria are the scene in our Gospel. Keim, while declaring himself for this view, admits besides other sources of Pauline origin ; for example, the document of the institution of the Holy Supper.§ It is impossible to doubt that the genealogical document 3 : 23, *et seq.* existed before our Gospel, and, such as it is, was inserted in it by the author (see on 3 : 23).

3. We must allow, further, the existence of longer and fuller documents which Luke might have used. Does he not speak himself, in his preface, of writings that were already numerous at the time he was writing (*πολλοί*), which in respect of contents must have been of very much the same nature as his own, that is to say, veritable Gospels? He designates them by the name of *διήγησις*, a word which has been wrongly applied to detached writings of the kind that Schleiermacher admitted, and which can only apply to a consecutive and more or less complete narrative. If such works existed in great number, and were known to Luke, it is difficult to think that he has not endeavored to profit by them. The only question then is, whether, on the

* "Ueber die Schriften des Lucas, ein Kritischer Versuch," von Schleiermacher, Berlin, 1817.
† "Die Evangelien," 1852.
‡ "Der Ursprung und die Compos. der syn. Evang." 1853.
§ "Geschichte Jesu," t. i., Zurich, 1867.

supposition that they no longer exist, we can form any idea of them by means of our Gospel, for the composition of which they supplied some materials. Keim thinks he recognizes, as a general basis of Luke's work, a Jewish-Christian Gospel, which must have been nearly related to our Matthew, very probably its direct descendant, but distinguished from it by an unhealthy tendency to Ebionitism and Dualism. The spirit of this fundamental document would betray itself all through Luke's work. Ewald imagines a whole series of writings of which Luke must have availed himself —a Hebrew Gospel by Philip the deacon, a collection of the discourses of Jesus by the Apostle Matthew, of which Papias speaks, etc. (see further on). Bleek,* reviving in a new form the hypothesis of a primitive Gospel (a manual composed, according to Eichhorn, for the use of evangelists, under apostolic sanction), admits, as a basis of our Gospels of Matthew and Luke, a Greek Gospel, written in Galilee by a believer, who at certain times had himself accompanied Jesus. This earliest account of the Saviour's life would mould all the subsequent evangelical narrations. The writings of the πολλοί, *many* (1 : 1), would be only variations of it, and our three synoptics merely different versions of the same. Lastly, we know that many critics at the present day find the principal source of Luke and the two other synoptics (at least of the narrative part) in a supposed Gospel of Mark, older than our canonical Mark, and to which they give the name of Proto-Mark (Reuss, Réville, Holtzmann, etc.).† All these writings, anterior to that of Luke, and only known to us by the traces of them discovered in his work, are lost at the present day.

4. Would it be impossible for some writing which we still possess to be one of the sources of Luke—for example, one of our two synoptics, or even both of them? This fourth means of explanation has at all times been employed by criticism. At the present day it is still used with great confidence by many. According to Baur,‡ Matthew was the direct and sole source of Luke ; Mark proceeded from both. Hilgenfeld also puts Matthew first ; but he interposes Mark between Matthew and Luke. According to Volkmar,§ Mark is the primary source ; from him proceeded Luke, and Matthew from both.

To sum up : Oral tradition, detached writings, Gospels more or less complete now lost ; last of all, one or other of our existing Gospels—such are the materials by means of which criticism has made various attempts to solve the problem of the origin, both of Luke in particular and of the synoptics in general. Let us endeavor now to describe the systems which actual criticism labors to construct out of these various kinds of materials.

II.

1. We will commence with the self-styled critical school of Baur. The common tendency of writers of this school is to represent the synoptics as deriving their contents from each other. In their view, the contents of our Gospels cannot be histori-

* "Einleitung in das N. T.," 1862 ; "Synoptische Erklärung der drei ersten Evangelien," 1869.

† Reuss, "Geschichte der heiligen Schriften N. T." 3d ed. 1860 ; Réville, "Etudes critiques sur l'évang. selon St. Matthieu," 1862 ; Holtzmann, "Die synopt. Ev." 1863.

‡ Baur, "Das Marcus-Evangelium," 1851.

§ Volkmar, "Die Evangelien," 1870.

cal, because they contain the inadmissible element of miracles.* Consequently they regard our Gospels, not as real historical narrations, but as compositions of a poetical or didactic character. The differences between them are not in any way natural divergences proceeding from such undesigned modifications as tradition undergoes in course of oral transmission, or from the diversity of written sources, but result from different dogmatic tendencies in the writers of the Gospels which they perfectly reflect. Each evangelist has reproduced his matter with a free hand, modifying it in accordance with his personal views. In reality, then, our Gospels are the reflection, not of the object they describe, but of the controversial or conciliatory tendencies of their authors. These books make us acquainted, not with the history of Jesus, but with that of the Church, and of the different theories respecting the Founder of the gospel, which have been successively held in it. This common result of the school appears in its most pronounced form in Baur and Volkmar, in a milder form in Köstlin and Hilgenfeld.

Baur himself, as we have seen, makes, as Griesbach and De Wette did before him, Luke proceed from Matthew, and Mark from Luke and Matthew united. This relationship is made out in this way. There was, first of all, a strictly legal and particularist Matthew, reflecting the primitive Christianity of the Twelve, and of the church of Jerusalem. From this original Matthew afterward proceeded our canonical Matthew, the narrative being recast in a universalist sense (between 130 and 134) In opposition to the original Matthew there appeared first a Luke, which was altogether Pauline, or anti-legal ; this was the writing Marcion adopted, and from which proceeded later on our canonical Luke. The latter was the result of a revision designed to harmonize it with the Jewish-Christian views (about 140). Reconciliation having thus been reached from both sides, Mark followed, in which the original contrast is entirely neutralized. For its matter, the latter is naturally dependent on the other two.

The "anonymous Saxon" † starts with the same general notion ; but he seasons it in a piquant fashion. According to him, our synoptics, with the exception of Luke, were indeed composed by the authors to whom the Church attributes them ; but they intentionally misrepresented the facts. As to the third, Paul, who was its author. composed it with a view to decry the Twelve and their party.

Hilgenfeld denies the opposition, admitted by Baur, between the original Matthew and a Luke which preceded ours. He believes that, in the very bosom of apostolic and Jewish-Christian Christianity, there was an internal development at work from the first century in a Pauline direction, the result partly of the force of events, but more especially of the influence of the fall of Jerusalem and the conversion of the Gentiles. He finds a proof of this gradual transformation in the numerous universalist passages of our canonical Matthew, which witness to the changes undergone by the original Matthew. This last writing, the oldest of the Gospels, dated from 70–80.

The Gospel of Mark, which followed it, went a step further in the Pauline direction. It was an imitation of the Gospel of Matthew, but at the same time modified by the oral tradition existing in the Church at Rome, which was derived from Peter ;

* Hilgenfeld ("Die Evangelien," p. 530 : "The principal argument for the later origin of our Gospels is always this fact, that they relate very many things about the life of Jesus, which certainly could not have taken place as they narrate them."

† "Sendschreiben an Baur über die Abfassungszeit des Lukas und der Synoptiker," 1848, p. 26, *et seq.*

it dates from the period from 80–100. Hilgenfeld, therefore, does not recognize Luke's influence anywhere in Mark, while Baur discovers it everywhere. Luke proceeds, according to him, from the two former ; he takes a fresh step in the universalist and Pauline direction. It was written before Marcion's time, from 100 to 110. Thus, as this theologian himself remarks, "the formation of our canonical Gospels was completely finished before the time when Baur makes it begin" ("Kanon," p. 172). With this difference as to dates between the master and his disciple, there is connected a more profound difference still. Instead of a sharp dogmatical contrast which was gradually neutralized, Hilgenfeld admits a progressive development in the very bosom of primitive Jewish Christianity.

With Baur, Mark came third ; with Hilgenfeld, second ; there was only wanted further a theologian of the same school who should assign him the first place ; and this is done at the present time by Volkmar, who follows the example of Storr in the last century. According to him, that fiery manifesto of primitive Jewish Christianity, the Apocalypse, had about 68 declared implacable hostility against St. Paul, representing him (chap. xiii.) as the false prophet of the last times, and making the churches founded by him, in comparison with the Jewish-Christian churches, a mere *plebs* (chap. vii.). A moderate Paulinian took up the gauntlet and wrote (about 73), as a reply our second Gospel, the oldest of all the writings of this kind. It was a didactic poem, on a historical basis,* designed to defend Paul and the right of the Gentile churches. Beyond the Old Testament and the Epistles of Paul, the author had no other sources than oral tradition, his Christian experience, the Apocalypse which he opposed, and his creative genius. Somewhat later (about the year 100), a Pauline believer of the Church of Rome, who had travelled in Palestine, worked up this book into a new form by the aid of some traditions which he had collected, and by inserting in it first a genealogical document (Genealogus Hebræorum), and then a writing of Essenist tendency (Evangelium pauperum). His aim was to win over to Paulinism the Jewish-Christian part of the Church, which was still in a majority. This was our Luke. Matthew is the result of a fusion of the two preceding writings. It is the manifesto of a moderate Jewish-Christian feeling, which desired to gather all the heathen into the Church, but could not see its way to this at the cost of the abolition of the law, as Paul taught ; its composition dates from 110. All the other writings, the existence of which has been supposed by modern criticism, such as a Proto-Matthew, the Logia, and a Proto-Mark, in Volkmar's judgment, are nothing but empty critical fancies.

The third, second, and first place in succession having been assigned to Mark, no new supposition seemed possible, at least from the same school. Nevertheless Köstlin has rendered possible the impossible, by assigning to Mark all three positions at once. This complicated construction is difficult to follow : The oldest evangelical record would be that Proto-Mark to which Papias must have referred ; it represented the moderate universalism of Peter. From this work, combined with oral tradition and the Logia of the Apostle Matthew, would proceed our canonical Matthew. These different works are supposed to have given birth to a Gospel of Peter, which closely resembled the original Mark, but was still more like our actual Mark. After that must have appeared Luke, to which all the preceding sources contributed ; and last

* "Die Evangelien," p. 461 : "Eine selbstbewusste Lehrpoesie auf historischen Grunde."

of all our actual Mark, which would be the result of a revision of the original Mark by the help of the canonical Matthew and Luke. The principal waymarks of the route thus traversed are these: Mark (I.); Matthew; Mark (II., or the Gospel of Peter); Luke; Mark (III.). We can only say that this hypothesis is the death-blow of the theory of the Tübingen school, as formerly Marsh's system was of the hypothesis of an original Gospel. The complicated and artificial form this hypothesis is compelled to assume, by the difficulties which weigh upon its simpler forms, is its condemnation. Thus, as Hilgenfeld regretfully observes, "after such multiplied and arduous labors we are still very far from reaching the least agreement even on the most essential points." Let it be observed that this disagreement is evinced by disciples of one and the same school, which advanced into the critical arena with colors flying, and thundering forth the pæan of victory. Is not such a state of things a serious fact, especially for a school the fundamental idea of which is, that there is an intimate connection between the successive appearances of our Gospels and the history of the primitive Church, of which last this school claims to give the world a new conception? Does not such a complete diversity in fixing the order in which the Gospels appeared, exhibit a no less fundamental disagreement in conceiving of the development of the Church? These are evident symptoms not only of the breaking up of this school, but, above all, of the radical error of the original notion on which it was founded. The opposition in principle between Paulinism and Jewish Christianity, which is an axiom with this school, is also its πρῶτον ψεῦδος.

2. We will now enumerate the critical systems which have kept independent of the Tübingen school.

If Bleek, who is at once the most discerning and judicious critic of our day, is in several respects the antipodes of Baur, he agrees with him on one point: the entire dependence he attributes to Mark in relation to the two other synoptics. As has been already mentioned, he makes Matthew and Luke proceed from a Gospel written in Greek by a Galilean believer, who was present at several scenes in the ministry of Jesus in this province. This is the reason why this book has given such great preponderance to the Galilean work. The numerous works of which Lukespeaks (1 : 1) were all different versions of this, as well as our canonical Matthew and Luke. This important book, with all its offshoots, which preceded our synoptics, is lost; these last, the most complete and best accredited, have alone survived. This conception is simple and clear. Whether it renders a sufficient account of the facts, remains to be seen.

Ritschl, in a remarkable article, has pronounced in favor of the absolute priority of our canonical Mark (to the exclusion of any Proto-Mark). Matthew proceeded, according to him, from Mark, and Luke from both.* Ritschl endeavors to prove these statements by a very sagacious analysis of the relations between the narratives of Matthew and Mark on certain points of detail. But the impression we have received from this labor is, that both the method followed, and the results obtained, are more ingenious than solid.

Reuss, Réville, Holtzmann, agree in making two writings, now lost, the original sources of our three synoptical Gospels. These were: 1. The Proto-Mark, which furnished our three evangelists with their general outline, and with the narratives common to them all; 2. The "Logia," or collection of discourses compiled by Mat-

* "Ueber den gegenwärtigen Stand der Kritik der syn. Ev.," in the "Theol. Jahrb." 1851.

thew, which was the source for those instructions of Jesus related in common by Matthew and Luke. Our canonical Mark is a reproduction (enlarged according to Reuss, abridged according to Holtzmann) of the former of these two writings. Its author made no use of the "Logia." Matthew and Luke both proceeded from a fusion of these two fundamental writings. Their authors inserted or distributed, in the outline sketch of the Proto-Mark, the sayings and discourses collected in the "Logia." But here arises a difficulty. If the sayings of Jesus, as Matthew and Luke convey them to us, are drawn from the same source, how does it happen that Matthew transmits them in the form of large masses of discourse (for example, the Sermon on the Mount, chap. 5 : 7 ; the collection of parables, chap. 13, etc.), while in Luke these very sayings are more frequently presented to us in the form of detached instructions, occasioned by some accidental circumstance? Of these two different forms, which is to be regarded as most faithful to the original document? Matthew, who groups into large masses the materials that lie side by side in the "Logia"? or Luke, who breaks up the long discourses of the "Logia," and divides them into a number of particular sayings? Holtzmann decides in favor of the first alternative. According to this writer, we ought to allow that the form of the "Logia" was very nearly that presented by the teaching of Jesus in the narrative of travel, Luke 9 : 51, 19 : 28. Weizsäcker, on the contrary, defends the second view, and thinks that the long discourses of Matthew are more or less faithful reproductions of the form of the "Logia." This also is the opinion of M. Réville. We shall have to see whether this hypothesis, under either of its two forms, bears the test of facts.

Ewald sets out in the same way with the two hypotheses of the Proto-Mark and the "Logia" ; but he constructs upon this foundation an exceedingly complicated system, according to which our Luke would be nothing less than the combined result of eight anterior writings : 1. A Gospel written by Philip the Evangelist, which described in the Aramæan language the salient facts of the life of Jesus, with short historical explanations. 2. Matthew's "Logia," or discourses of Jesus, furnished with short historical introductions. 3. The Proto-Mark, composed by the aid of the two preceding writings, remarkable for the freshness and vivacity of its coloring, and differing very little from our canonical Mark. 4. A Gospel treating of certain critical points in our Lord's life (the temptation, for example). Ewald calls this writing the "Book of the Higher History." 5. Our canonical Matthew, combining the "Logia" of this apostle with all the other writings already named. 6, 7, and 8. Three writings now lost, which Ewald describes as though he had them in his hands : one of a familiar, tender character ; another somewhat brusque and abrupt ; the third comprising the narratives of the infancy (Luke 1 and 2). Lastly, 9. Our canonical Luke, composed by the aid of all the preceding (with the exception of our Matthew), and which simply combines the materials furnished by the others. We may add, 10. Our canonical Mark, which with very slight modification is the reproduction of No. 3. This construction certainly does not recommend itself by its intrinsic evidence and simplicity. It may prove as fatal to the hypothesis of a Proto-Mark as was formerly that of Marsh to the hypothesis of a primitive Gospel, or as that of Köstlin at the present day to the Tübingen idea.

Lastly, we see a new mode of explanation appearing, which seems destined to replace for a time the theory, so stoutly maintained by and since Wilke, of the priority of Mark or of the Proto-Mark, whenever it has any considerable connection with

this last. This opinion has been developed by Weiss in three very elaborate articles,* in which he seeks to prove : 1. That the most ancient work was an apostolical Matthew, comprising the discourses, some longer and others shorter, with a large number of facts, but without any intention on the part of the author to write the entire history of Jesus. 2. Thereupon appeared Mark, written by the aid of recollections which the author had preserved of the recitals of Peter. This was the first attempt to trace the entire course of the ministry of Jesus. He included in this sketch all the sayings of Jesus contained in the preceding work which could be adapted to his narrative. 3. The author of our canonical Matthew made use of this work of Mark, rewrote it, and supplemented it by the aid of the apostolical Matthew. 4. Luke also rewrote the two more ancient works, the apostolic Matthew and Mark, but in a very free manner, and enriched his narrative with new materials derived from oral or written tradition.

This combination appears to me to come very near the explanation, which is the basis of a recent work of Klostermann.† By a consecutive, detailed, delicate analysis of the Gospel of Mark, this scholar proves that the author of this work composed it on the basis of Matthew, enamelling the story with explanatory notes, the substance of which evidently emanated from an eye-witness of the ministry of Jesus, which could have been none other than Peter ; in general, the additions refer to the relations of Jesus with His apostles. With Klostermann, as with Weiss, Matthew would be the first and principal written source ; but with this difference (if we rightly understand), that with the former this Matthew is our canonical Matthew, while in the opinion of Weiss, this last writing differed sensibly from the primitive Matthew, which only appears in our canonical Matthew as transformed by means of Mark. The dependence of Mark on Matthew has then much more stress laid upon by it Klostermann than by Weiss. Klostermann announces a second work, in which he will prove a precisely similar dependence of Luke upon Mark. Thus it is clear, that in proportion as criticism dispenses with the hypothesis of a Proto-Mark, it is compelled to attribute to the primitive Matthew, which at the outset was to be only a collection of discourses, more and more of the historical element ; so that in Weiss it again becomes a more or less complete Gospel, and lastly in Klostermann approximates closely to our canonical Matthew itself.

This question of the origin of the synoptics, and of their mutual relations, must not be regarded as unimportant in regard to the substance of the evangelical beliefs. Just as the view defended by the Tübingen school, according to which our synoptics are simply derived from one another, exhibits the contents of these writings, and the degree of confidence they inspired at the time they appeared, in an unfavorable light (since the differences which exist between them could, in such a case only proceed from the caprice of the copyists, and the slight faith they placed in the story of their predecessors) ; so does the other opinion, which looks for different sources, oral or written, whence each writing proceeds, and which are adequate to account for their mutual resemblances or differences, tend to re-establish their general credibilty, and their genuineness as historical works.

* In the "Studien und Kritiken," 1861 ; "Jahrbücher fur Deutsche Theologie," 1861 ; Ibid. 1865. Since then, Weiss has attempted to prove his theory by a detailed exegesis of Mark.

† "Das Marcus-Evangelium," Göttingen, 1867.

The following is a table of the opinions of which we have just given an account :

I.—SCHOOL OF TUEBINGEN.

BAUR.

Matthew, Luke } Mark.

VOLKMAR.

Mark, Luke } Matthew.

HILGENFELD.

Matthew, Mark } Luke.

KOESTLIN.

Mark (I.) ; Matthew
Mark (II.) or Gospel of Peter
Luke.
} Mark (III.).

II.—INDEPENDENT SYSTEMS.

RITSCHL.

Mark, Matthew } Luke.

EWALD.

Gosp. of Phil. Logia
Mark (I.)
Matthew.
} Luke.

BLEEK.

Primitive Gospel
Matthew ; Luke
Mark.

WEISS.

Matthew (I.)
Mark
Matthew (II.); Luke.

REUSS, etc.

Mark (I.) Logia
Mark (II.) ; Matthew ; Luke.

KLOSTERMANN.

Matthew, Mark } Luke.

The state of things which this table portrays is not certainly such as to lead us to regard the question as solved, and the door closed against fresh attempts to explain the origin of the synoptics, particularly the origin of Luke, which is the final term of the problem.

SEC. V.—ON THE PRESERVATION OF THE THIRD GOSPEL.

Are we sure that we possess the book which we are about to study as it came from its author's hands ? Taken as a whole, yes. As guarantees of it, we have—1. The general agreement of our text with the most ancient versions, the *Peschito* and the *Italic*, which date from the second century, and with the three Egyptian translations made at the beginning of the third ; 2. The general agreement of this text with the quotations of the Fathers of the second and third centuries, Justin, Tatian, Irenæus, Clement, Tertullian, Origen, etc. ; lastly, 3. The general uniformity of the manuscripts in which the Greek text has been preserved. If any great changes had been introduced into the text, there would inevitably have been much greater differences among all these documents. These different tests prove that the third Gospel, just as we have it, was already in existence in the churches of the second and third centuries. A text so universally diffused could only proceed from the text that was received from the very first.

The manuscripts containing the text of the New Testament consist of majuscules, or manuscripts written in uncial letters (until the tenth century), and of minuscules or manuscripts written in small or cursive writing (from the tenth century). The manuscripts known at the present day, containing the whole or part of the Gospels number nearly 44 majuscules, and more than 500 minuscules. The former are, for their antiquity and variety, the most important. Of this number, 19 contain the Gospel

of Luke more or less complete ; of 11 there only remain some fragments, or series of fragments : there are, in all, 30 documents prior to the tenth century.

Two of the fourth century :

1. The *Sinaiticus* (ℵ).
2. The *Vaticanus* (B.)

Five of the fifth century :

3. The *Alexandrinus* (A).
4. The *Codex Ephræmi* (C).
5. Twenty-eight palimpsest leaves (I).
6. Palimpsest fragments found at Wolfenbüttel (Q).
7. Different fragments, Greek with a Sahidic version, comprised in the Sahidic collection of Woide (T^w). T^d denotes similar fragments of the seventh century.

Five of the sixth century :

8. The *Cantabrigiensis* (D).
9. Fragments of a manuscript *de luxe*, written in letters of silver and gold (N).
10. The hymns of Luke (chap. 1, 2), preserved in some psalters (O^c). O^{abeef} denote similar portions of the seventh and ninth centuries.
11. Fragments of a palimpsest of London (R).
12. Fragments of Wolfenbüttel (P).

Five of the eighth century :

13. The *Basiliensis* (E).
14. A manuscript of Paris (L).
15. Fragments of the Gospels, of Paris and of Naples (W^a ; W^b).
16. Fragment of Luke at St. Petersburg (Θ^d).
17. The *Zacynthius*, a palimpsest manuscript, found at Zante, comprising the first eleven chapters of Luke (Ξ in Tischendorf, Z in our commentary).

Eight of the ninth century :

18. The Codex *Boreeli* (F).
19. The *Cyprius* (K).
20. A manuscript of Paris (M).
21. A manuscript of Munich (X).
22. A manuscript of Oxford (Γ).
23. The *San Gallensis* (Δ).
24. A manuscript of Oxford (Λ).
25. A manuscript found at Smyrna, and deposited at St. Petersburg (Π).

Five of the tenth century :

26, 27. The two Codd. of *Seidel* (G, H).
28. A manuscript of the Vatican (S).
29. A manuscript of Venice (U).
30. A manuscript of Moscow (V).

Adding together all the various readings which these documents contain, we find from five to six thousand of them. But in general they are of very secondary importance, and involve no change in the matter of the Gospel history.

On a closer study of them, it is observed that certain manuscripts habitually go together in opposition to others, and thus two principal forms of the text are established—one which is generally found in the most ancient majuscules, another which

is met with in the minuscules and in the less ancient of the majuscules. Some manuscripts oscillate between these two forms.

As the text on which Erasmus formed the first edition of the New Testament in Greek was that of certain minuscules in the Bâle library, and this text has continued to form the basis of subsequent editions, of which that of the Elzevirs of 1633 is the most generally diffused, it is evident that this, called the Received Text, is rather that of the minuscules and less ancient majuscules than the text of the old majuscules. This text is also called Byzantine, because it is probably the one which was uniformly fixed in the churches of the Greek Empire. Those of our majuscules which represent it are the following : E. F. G. H. R. M. S. U. V. Γ. Δ. Π. This form of the text is also called Asiatic.

The opposite form, which is found in the older majuscules, B. G. L. R. X Z., appears to come from Alexandria, where, in the first centuries of the Church, manuscripts were most largely produced. For this reason this text takes the name of Alexandrine. Some manuscripts, while ordinarily following the Alexandrine, differ from them more or less frequently ; these are ℵ. A. D. Δ. The text of ℵ and of D resembles, in many instances, the ancient Latin translation, the *Italic*.

A middle form between these two principal texts is found in the fragments denoted by N. O. W. Y. Θ.

It is a constant question, which of the two texts, the Alexandrine or the Byzantine, reproduces with the greatest fidelity the text of the original document. It is a question which, in our opinion, cannot be answered in a general way and *à priori*, and which must be solved in each particular instance by exegetical skill.

ABBREVIATIONS.

The abbreviations we shall use are generally those which Tischendorf has adopted in his eighth edition.

1. Fathers.

Just., Justin ; Ir., Irenæus ; Or., Origen, etc.

2. Versions.

Vss., versions.

It., the *Italic*, comprising the different Latin translations prior to Jerome's (from the second century) : *a*, *b*, *c*, etc. denote the different documents of the *Italic ; a* the *Vercellensis* (4th c.) ; *b* the *Veronensis* (5th c.) ; *c* the *Colbertinus* (11th c.), etc.

Vg., the *Vulgate*, Jerome's translation (4th c.) ; Am., Fuld., denote the principal documents of this translation—the *Amiatinus* (6th c.), the *Fuldensis* (id.), etc.

Syr., the Syriac translations. Syr^{sch}, the *Paschito*, Schaaf's edition ; Syr^{cur}, a more ancient translation than the *Peschito*, discovered and published by Cureton. *Syr.* in brief (in our own use), these two united.

Cop., the Coptic translation (3d c.).

3. Manuscripts.

Mss., the manuscripts ; Mjj., the majuscules ; Mnn., the minuscules.

The letter denoting a manuscript with the sign * (ℵ*, B*) denotes the original text in opposition to corrections inserted in the text afterward. The small figures added to this same letter (B^2, C^2, etc.) signify first, second correction. For the manuscript

א. which is in a peculiar condition, א^{a}, א^{b} denote the most ancient corrections, made by at least two different hands according to the text of different MSS. from that from which א was copied, and א^{c} similar corrections, but made a little later (7th c.), and differing sometimes from each other (א^{ca} א^{cb}). F^{a}, some quotations from the Gospels annotated in the margin of the *Coislinianus* (H. of the Epistles of Paul).

4. Editions.

T. R., the received text, viz. the ed. *Elzevir* of 1633, which is generally the reproduction of the third ed. of Stephens; ς (Steph.) denotes the received text and that of Stephens united, where they are identical; ς^{e} (Steph. Elzev.), the received text alone, in the rare instances in which these two texts differ.

THE TITLE OF THE GOSPEL.

The shortest form is found in א. B. F., *κατὰ Λουκᾶν*. The greater part of the Mjj. read *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Λουκᾶν*. The T. R., with some Mnn. only, *τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγ.* Some Mnn., *τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν ἅγιον εὐαγγ.*

In the opinion of several scholars (Reuss. "Gesch. der heil. Schr. N. T." § 177), the prep. *κατὰ, according to,* signifies not: composed by, but: drawn up according to the conception of. . . . Thus this title, so far from affirming that our Gospel was composed by the person designated, would rather deny it. This sense does not appear to us admissible. Not only may the preposition *κατὰ* apply to the writer himself, as the following expressions prove: *ἡ κατὰ Μωϋσέα πεντάτευχος* (the Pentateuch according to Moses) in Epiphanius; *ἡ καθ' Ἡρόδοτον ἱστορία* (the history according to Herodotus) in Diodorus; *Ματθαῖος . . . γραφῇ παραδοὺς τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγέλιον* (Matthew having but in writing the Gospel according to him) in Eusebius (H. Eccl. iii. 24);—but this preposition must have this sense in our title. For, 1. The titles of our four Gospels bear too close a resemblance to each other to have come from the authors of these writings; they must have been framed by the Church when it formed the collection of the Gospels. Now the opinion of the Church, as far as we can trace it, has always been, that these writings were composed by the persons named in the titles. 2. With respect to the third Gospel in particular, no other sense is possible. Apostles and eye-witnesses, such as Matthew or John, might have created an original conception of the Gospel, and afterward a different writer might have produced a narrative of the ministry of Jesus according to this type. But this supposition is not applicable to persons so secondary and dependent as Luke or Mark.

This Luke, whom the title designates as the author of our Gospel, can be no other than the companion of Paul. The evangelical history mentions no other person of this name. As to the term Gospel, it appears to us very doubtful whether in our four titles it indicates the writings themselves. This term applies rather, as throughout the New Testament, to the facts related, to the contents of the books, to the coming of Christ—this merciful message of God to mankind. The complement understood after *εὐαγγέλιον* is *Θεοῦ*; comp. Rom 1 : 1. This good news, though one in itself, is presented to the world under four different aspects in these four narratives. The meaning then is, "The good news of the coming of Christ, according to the version of . . ." It is the *εὐαγγέλιον τετράμορφον*, the Gospel with four faces, of which Irenæus still speaks toward the end of the second century, even after the term Gospel had been already applied by Justin to the written Gospels.

PROLOGUE.

Chap. 1 :1–4.

The first of our synoptic Gospels opens with a genealogy. This mode of entering upon the subject transports us into a completely Jewish world. This preamble is, as it were, a continuation of the genealogical registers of Genesis ; in the βίβλος γενέσεως of Matthew (1 : 1) we have again the Ellé Tholedoth of Moses.

How different Luke's prologue, and in what an entirely different atmosphere it places us from the first ! Not only is it written in most classical Greek, but it reminds us by its contents of the similar preambles of the most illustrious Greek historians, especially those of Herodotus and Thucydides. The more thoroughly we examine it, the more we find of that delicacy of sentiment and refinement of mind which constitute the predominant traits of the Hellenic character. Baur, it is true, thought he discerned in it the work of a forger. Ewald, on the contrary, admires its true simplicity, noble modesty, and terse conciseness.* It appears to us, as to Holtzmann,† " that between these two opinions the choice is not difficult." The author does not seek to put himself in the rank of the Christian authorities ; he places himself modestly among men of the second order. He feels it necessary to excuse the boldness of his enterprise, by referring to the numerous analogous attempts that have preceded his own. He does not permit himself to undertake the work of writing a Gospel history until he has furnished himself with all the aids fitted to enable him to attain the lofty aim he sets before him. There is a striking contrast between his frank and modest attitude and that of a forger. It excludes even the ambitious part of a secretary of the Apostle Paul, which tradition has not been slow to claim for the author of our Gospel.

This prologue is not least interesting for the information it contains respecting the earliest attempts at writing histories of the Gospel Apart from these first lines of Luke, we know absolutely nothing definite about the more ancient narratives of the life of Jesus which preceded the composition of our Gospels. Therefore every theory as to the origin of the synoptics, which is not constructed out of the materials furnished by this preface, runs the risk of being thrown aside as a tissue of vain hypotheses the day after it has seen the light

This introduction is a dedication, in which Luke initiates the reader into the idea, method, and aim of his work. He is far from being the first who has attempted to handle this great subject (ver. 1). Numerous written narratives on the history of Jesus are already in existence ; they all of them rest on the oral narrations of the apostles (ver. 2). But while drawing also on this original source, Luke has collected more particular information, in order to supplement, select, and properly arrange the materials for which the Church is indebted to apostolic tradition. His aim, lastly, is to furnish his readers, by this connected account of the facts, with the means of establishing their certainty (ver. 4).

Vers. 1–4. " Since, as is known, many have undertaken to compose a narrative of the events which have been accomplished among us, (2) in conformity with that which they have handed down to us who were eye-witnesses of them from the beginning, and who became ministers of the word, (3) I have thought good also myself,

* " Jahrbücher," ii. p. 128. † " Die Synoptischen Evangelien," p. 398.

after carefully informing myself of all these facts from their commencement, to write a consecutive account of them for thee, most excellent Theophilus, (4) in order that thou mightest know the immovable certainty of the instructions which thou hast received." * This period, truly Greek in its style, has been composed with particular care. We do not find a style like it in all the New Testament, except at the end of the Acts and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. As to the thought of this prologue, it cannot be better summed up than in these lines of Tholuck. "Although not an immediate witness of the facts that took place, I have none the less undertaken, following the example of many others, to publish an account of them according to the information I have gathered." †

The conjunction ἐπειδήπερ is found nowhere else in the New Testament; it has a certain solemnity. To the idea of since (ἐπεί), δή adds that of notoriety: "since, as is well known:" περ draws attention to the relation between the great number of these writings and the importance of the events related: It is so (δή), and it could not be otherwise (περ). The relation between the *since* thus defined and the principal verb, *I have thought good*, is easy to seize. If my numerous predecessors have not been blamed, why should I be blamed, who am only walking in their steps? The term ἐπεχείρησαν, *have undertaken*, involves no blame of the skill of these predecessors, as several Fathers have thought; the *I have thought good also myself* is sufficient to exclude this supposition. This expression is suggested by the greatness of the task, and contains a slight allusion to the insufficiency of the attempts hitherto made to accomplish it.

The nature of these older writings is indicated by the term ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν, *to set in order a narrative*. It is a question, as Thiersch ‡ says, of an attempt at arrangement. Did this arrangement consist in the harmonizing of a number of separate writings into a single whole, so as to make a consecutive history of them? In this case, we should have to admit that the writers of whom Luke speaks had already found in the Church a number of short writings on particular events, which they had simply united: their work would thus constitute a second step in the development of the writing of the Gospel history. But the expression, "in conformity with that which they have handed down to us," hardly leaves room for intermediate accounts between the apostolic tradition and the writings of which Luke speaks. The notion of arrangement, then, refers rather to the facts themselves which these authors had co-ordinated in such a way as to make a consecutive narrative of them. The term diegesis designates not, as Schleiermacher maintained, recitals of isolated facts, but a complete narrative.

What idea should we form of these writings, and are they to be ranked among the sources on which Luke has drawn? Certain extra-canonical Gospels, which criticism

* A literal translation of M. Godet's rendering of Luke's preface is given here, for the sake of harmonizing the text with the verbal comments which follow in the next paragraph; but, except when something turns on our author's rendering, the passages commented on will be given in the words of the A. V. A close and happy translation of the original Greek into French does not always admit of being reproduced literally in English, and a free translation of a translation is of little service for purposes of exegesis.—*Note by the Translator.*

† "Glaubwürdigk. der evang. Gesch." p. 143.

‡ "Versuch zur Herstellung des historischen Standpunkts für die Kritik der Neutestamentl. Schr." p. 164 (a work which we cannot too strongly recommend to beginners, although we are far from sharing all its views)

has sometimes regarded as prior to Luke's, may be thought of—that of the Hebrews, for example, in which Lessing was disposed to find the common source of our three synoptics; or that of Marcion, which Ritschl and Baur regarded as the principal document reproduced by Luke.* But does not tradition exhibit itself in these writings in a form already perceptibly altered, and very far removed from the primitive purity and freshness which characterize our canonical Gospels? They are, then, later than Luke.

Or does Luke allude to our Gospels of Matthew and Mark? This is maintained by those who think that Luke wrote after Matthew and Mark (Hug), or only after Matthew (Griesbach, etc.). But however little Luke shared in the traditional opinion which attributed the first Gospel to the Apostle Matthew, he could not speak of that writing as he speaks here; for he clearly opposes to the writers of the tradition (the πολλοί, ver. 1), the apostles who were the authors of it. It may be affirmed, from the connection of ver. 2 with ver. 1, that Luke was not acquainted with a single written Gospel emanating from an apostle. As to the collection of the "Logia" (discourses of the Lord), which some attribute to Matthew, it certainly would not be excluded by Luke's expressions; for the term diegesis denotes a recital, a historical narrative. Hug, in his desire to save his hypothesis, according to which Luke made use of Matthew, explained vers. 1 and 2 in this sense: "Many have undertaken to compose written Gospels similar to those which the apostles bequeathed to us. . ." But this sense would require ὁποῖα (βιβλία) instead of καθώς,† and has not been accepted by any one. As to the Gospel of Mark, Luke's expressions might certainly suit this writing. For, according to tradition, Mark made use in his narrative of the accounts of an eye-witness, St. Peter. But still it may be questioned whether Luke would have employed the term *undertake* in speaking of a work which was received in the Church as one of the essential documents of the life of Jesus. For the rest, exegesis alone can determine whether Luke really had Mark before him either in its present or in a more ancient form. It appears probable, therefore, to me, that the works to which Luke alludes are writings really unknown and lost. Their incompleteness condemned them to extinction, in proportion as writings of superior value, such as our synoptics, spread through the Church.

As to whether Luke availed himself of these writings, and in any way embodied them in his own work, he does not inform us. But is it not probable, since he was acquainted with them, that he would make some use of them? Every aid would appear precious to him in a work the importance of which he so deeply felt.

The subject of these narratives is set forth in expressions that have a touch of solemnity: "the events which have been accomplished among us." Πληροφορεῖν is a word analogous in composition and meaning to τελεσφορεῖν (*to bring to an end, to maturity*, 8 : 14). It signifies, when it refers to a fact, to bring it to complete accomplishment (2 Tim. 4 : 5, to accomplish the ministry; ver. 17, to accomplish [to finish rendering] the testimony); and when it refers to a person it means to cause him to attain inward fulness [of conviction], that is to say, a conviction which leaves no room for doubt (Rom. 4 : 21, 14 : 5; Heb. 10 : 22, etc.). With a substantive such as πράγματα, the second sense is inadmissible. Nevertheless, it has been defended by some of the Fathers, by some modern interpreters, as Beza, Grotius, Olshausen, and

* Ritschl has since withdrawn this assertion.

† Thiersch, "Versuch," etc., p. 211.

by Meyer, who concludes from 2 Tim. 4 : 17 that πληροφεῖσθαι may also be applied to things in the sense of being believed. But when Paul says, "In order that the testimony might be accomplished, and that all the Gentiles might hear it," the last words plainly show that accomplished signifies not fully believed, but fully rendered. This term, which has more weight than the simple πληροῦν, is designedly chosen here to indicate that these events were not simple accidents, but accomplished a preconceived plan; the divine thought carried into execution was, as it were, a measure which filled up itself. Doubtless, what has led many interpreters to prefer the sense of fully believed, is the complement among us. This is said that the facts of the Gospel were accomplished not only in the presence of believers, but before the Jewish people and the whole world. This is true; but was not Jesus from the beginning surrounded by a circle of disciples, chosen to be witnesses of His life? It is with this meaning that John says, 20 : 30, "Jesus did many other miracles in the presence of His disciples;" and 1 : 14, "He dwelt among us (ἐν ἡμῖν), and we saw His glory"—a sentence in which the last words limit the *us* to the circle of believers. The meaning is the same here. In ver. 2 the sense of the word *us* is more limited still. Here *us* denotes the Church with the apostles; in ver. 2, the Church apart from the apostles. Bleek extends the meaning of the word *us*, in ver. 1, to the whole contemporary generation, both within and without the Church. But Luke, writing for believers, could scarcely use *us* in such a general sense as this. In this expression, "the events accomplished among us," did the author include also the contents of the book of the Acts, and did he intend the preface to apply to the two books, so that the Acts would be just the second volume of the Gospel? The words *among us* would be more easily explained in this case, and the mention made of the apostles as ministers of the word (ver. 2) might lead us to this supposition. It is not probable, however, that Luke would have applied to the facts related in the Acts the expressions παράδοσις, *tradition* (ver. 2), and κατήχησις, *instruction* (ver. 4). The subject of apostolical tradition and catechetical instruction could only be the history and teaching of Jesus. It is impossible, therefore, to infer from this preface that when Luke wrote his Gospel he had in view the composition of the book of the Acts.

Ver. 2. Tradition emanating from the apostles was the common source, according to ver. 2, of all the first written narratives. The general accuracy of these accounts follows from καθώς, *in conformity with that which*. This conjunction can only refer to the principal thought of ver. 1, to compose a narrative, and not to the secondary idea, πεπληροφορημένων, as Olshausen thinks, who translates, "fully believed in conformity with the account of the first witnesses." As the two substantives, αὐτόπται and ὑπηρέται, *witnesses* and *ministers*, have each certain defining expressions which especially belong to them (the first, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, *from the beginning*, and the second, γενόμενοι, *become*, and τοῦ λόγου, *of the word*), the most simple construction appears to us to be to regard *οἱ*, *the*, as a pronoun, and make it the subject of the proposition: they (the men about to be pointed out). This subject is defined by the two following substantives, which are in apposition, and indicate the qualification in virtue of which these men became the authors of the tradition. 1. Witnesses from the beginning. The word ἀρχή, *beginning*, in this context, can only refer to the commencement of the ministry of Jesus, particularly to His baptism, as the starting-point of those things which have been accomplished among us. Comp. Acts 1 : 21, 22, for the sense; and for the expression, John 15 : 27, 16 : 4. Olshausen would extend the application of this title of witnesses from the beginning to the witnesses of the birth

and infancy of Jesus. But the expression *became ministers of the word* does not allow of this application. 2. Ministers of the word ; become ministers, as the text literally reads. This expression is in contrast with the preceding. These men began afterward to be ministers of the word ; they only became such after Pentecost. It was then that their part as witnesses was transformed into that of preachers. The sense then is : " Those who were witnesses from the commencement, and who afterward became ministers of the word." If *ὑπηρέται, ministers*, is thus taken as a second noun of apposition with *οἱ*, parallel to the first, there is no longer any difficulty in referring the complement *τοῦ λόγου, of the word*, to *ὑπηρεται*, ministers, alone, and taking this word in its ordinary sense of preaching the Gospel. This also disposes of the reason which induced certain Fathers (Origen, Athanaisus) to give the term *word* the meaning of the eternal Word (John 1 : 1), which is very forced in this connection. Only in this way could they make this complement depend simultaneously on the two substantives, witnesses and ministers. The same motive led Beza, Grotius, and Bleek to understand the term *word* here in the sense in which it is frequently taken—the thing related : " eye-witnesses and ministers of the Gospel history." But in passages where the term *word* bears this meaning, it is fixed by some defining expression : thus, at ver. 4 by the relative proposition and, in Acts 8 : 21, 15 : 6 (which Bleek quotes), by a demonstrative pronoun.

With the third verse we reach the principal proposition. Luke places himself by the *κἀμοὶ, myself also*, in the same rank as his predecessors. He does not possess, any more than they, a knowledge of the Gospel history as a witness ; he belongs to the second generation of the *ἡμεῖς, us* (ver. 2), which is dependent on the narratives of the apostles. Some Italic MSS. add here to *mihi, et spiritui sancto* (it has pleased me and the Holy Spirit), a gloss taken from Acts 15 : 28, which clearly shows in what direction the tradition was gradually altered.

While placing himself in the same rank as his predecessors, Luke nevertheless claims a certain superiority in comparison with them. Otherwise, why add to their writings, which are already numerous (*πολλοί*), a fresh attempt? This superiority is the result of his not having confined himself to collecting the apostolic traditions current in the Church. Before proceeding to write, he obtained exact information, by means of which he was enabled to select, supplement, and arrange the materials furnished by those oral narratives which his predecessors had contented themselves with reproducing just as they were. The verb *παρακολουθειν, to follow step by step*, is not used here in the literal sense ; this sense would require *πᾶσιν* to be taken as masculine : *all the apostles*, and thus would lead to an egregiously false idea ; the author could not have accompanied all the apostles ! The verb, therefore, must be taken in the figurative sense which it frequently has in the classics : to study anything point by point ; thus Demosth. de coronâ, 53 ; *παρακολουθηκὼς τοὶς πράγμασιν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*. Comp. 2 Tim. 3 : 10, where we see the transition from the purely literal to the figurative meaning. The *πάντα, all things*, are the events related (ver. 1). Luke might have put the participle in the accusative : *παρακολουθηκότα* ; but then he would only have indicated the succession of the two actions—the acquisition of information, and the composition which followed it. This is not his thought. The dative makes the information obtained a quality inherent in his person, which constitutes his qualification for the accomplishment of this great work.

Luke's information bore particularly on three points : 1. He sought first of all to go back to the origin of the facts, to the very starting-point of this *res christiana*

which he desired to describe. This is expressed in the word *ἄνωθεν*, literally from above, from the very beginning. The author compares himself to a traveller who tries to discover the source of a river, in order that he may descend it again and follow its entire course. The apostolic tradition, as current in the Church, did not do this; it began with the ministry of John the Baptist and the baptism of Jesus. It is in this form that we find it set forth in the Gospel of Mark, and summarized in Peter's preaching at the house of Cornelius, and in Paul's at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts 10 : 37 *et seq.*, 13 : 23 *et seq.*). The author here alludes to the accounts contained in the first two chapters of his Gospel. 2. After having gone back to the commencement of the Gospel history, he endeavored to reproduce as completely as possible its entire course (*πᾶσιν, all things*, all the particular facts which it includes). Apostolic tradition probably had a more or less fragmentary character; the apostles not relating every time the whole of the facts, but only those which best answered to the circumstances in which they were preaching. This is expressly said of St. Peter on the testimony of Papias, or of the old presbyter on whom he relied: *πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας* (he chose each time the facts appropriate to the needs of his hearers). Important omissions would easily result from this mode of evangelization. By this word, *πᾶσιν, all things*, Luke probably alludes to that part of his Gospel (9 : 51, 18 : 14), by which the tradition, as we have it set forth in our first two synoptics, is enriched with a great number of facts and new discourses, and with the account of a long course of evangelization probably omitted, until Luke gave it, in the public narration. 3. He sought to confer on the Gospel history that exactness and precision which tradition naturally fails to have, after being handed about for some time from mouth to mouth. We know how quickly, in similar narratives, characteristic traits are effaced, and the facts transposed. Diligent and scrupulous care is required afterward to replace the stones of the edifice in their right position, and give them their exact form and sharpness of edge. Now the third Gospel is distinguished, as we shall see, by the constant effort to trace the continued progressive development of the work of Jesus, to show the connection of the facts, to place each discourse in its historical setting, and to exhibit its exact purport.

By means of this information bearing upon the three points indicated, the author hopes he shall be qualified to draw a consecutive picture, reproducing the actual course of events: *καθεξῆς γράψαι, to write in order*. It is impossible in this connection to understand the phrase *in order* in the sense of a systematic classification, as Ebrard prefers; here the term must stand for a chronological order. The term *καθεξῆς* is not found in the New Testament except in Luke.

Ver. 4. And now, what is the aim of the work thus conceived? To strengthen the faith of Theophilus and his readers in the reality of this extraordinary history. On Theophilus, see the Introduction, sec. 3. The epithet *κράτιστος* is applied several times, in the writings of Luke, to high Roman officials, such as Felix and Festus: Acts 23 : 26, 24 : 3, 26 · 25. It is frequently met with in medals of the time. Luke wishes to show his friend and patron that he is not unmindful of the exalted rank he occupies. But in his opinion, one mention suffices. He does not deem it necessary to repeat this somewhat ceremonious form at the beginning of the book of the Acts. The work executed on the plan indicated is to give Theophilus the means of ascertaining and verifying (*ἐπιγινώσκειν*) *the irrefragable certainty* (*ἀσφάλειαν*) of the instruction which he had already received. The construction of this last phrase has been understood in three ways. The most complicated is to understand a second

περί: τὴν ἀσφάλειαν περὶ τῶν λόγων περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης; the second and more simple, adopted by Bleek, is to make περί depend not on ἀσφάλειαν, but on κατηχήθης: τὴν ἀσφάλειαν τῶν λόγων περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης. But the example κατηχήθησαν περί σου (Acts 21 : 21), which Bleek quotes, is not analogous; for there the object of περί is personal: "they are informed of thee." The simplest construction is this: τὴν ἀσφάλειαν περὶ τῶν λόγων οὓς κατηχήθης, certitude touching the instruction which . . . Comp. for this form κατηχεῖσθαί τι, Acts 28 : 25; Gal. 6 : 6. The term κατηχεῖν, to cause a sound to penetrate into the ears, and thereby also a fact, an idea, into the mind, may simply mean that intelligence of the great events of which Luke speaks had reached Theophilus by public report (Acts 21 : 21, 24); or it may denote instruction properly so called, as Rom. 2 : 18; Acts 18 : 25, Gal. 6 : 6; neither the expressions nor the context appear to me to offer sufficient reasons to decide which. Perhaps the truth lies between these two extreme opinions. Theophilus might have talked with Christian evangelists without receiving such catechetical instruction, in the strict sense of the term, as was often given them when a church was founded (Thiersch, "Versuch," p. 122 *et seq.*); and then have applied to Luke with a view to obtain through his labors something more complete. The word ἀσφάλειαν, is relegated to the end, to express with greater force the idea of the irrefragable certainty of the facts of the Gospel.

It is a very nice question whether the term λόγοι, which we have translated *instruction*, here refers solely to the historical contents of the Gospel, or also to the religious meaning of the facts, as that comes out of the subsequent narrative. In the former case, Luke would simply mean that the certainty of each particular fact was established by its relation to the whole, which could not well be invented. An extraordinary fact, which, presented separately, appears impossible, becomes natural and rational when it takes its place in a well-certified sequence of facts to which it belongs.* In strictness, this meaning might be sufficient. But when we try to identify ourselves completely with the author's mind, do we not see, in this instruction of which he speaks, something more than a simple narrative of facts? Does not the passage in 1 Cor. 15 : 1–4 show that, in apostolic instruction, religious comment was inseparable from the historical text? Was it not with a view to faith that facts were related in the preaching of the Gospel? and does not faith, in order to appropriate them, require an exposition of their meaning and importance? The instruction already received by Theophilus refers, then, without doubt to the Gospel history, but not as isolated from its religious interpretation; and since we have to do here with a reader belonging to a circle of Christians of heathen origin, the signification given to this history could be none other than that twofold principle of the universality and free grace of salvation which constituted the substance of what Paul called his Gospel. Luke's object, then, was to relate the Christian fact in such a way as to show that, from its very starting-point, the work and preaching of Jesus Himself had had no other meaning. This was the only way of making evangelical

* The Catholic missionaries, Huc and Gabet, in their "Travels in Tartary" (vol. ii. p. 136), relate as follows: "We had adopted [in regard to the Buddhist priests among whom they lived] an entirely historical mode of teaching. . . . Proper names and precise dates made much more impression on them than the most logical arguments. . . . The close connection which they remarked in the history of the Old and New Testaments was, in their view, a demonstration." Is not that the καθεξῆς γράψαι ἵνα ἐπιγνῷς . . . τὴν ἀσφάλειαν?

instruction, as formulated by St. Paul, rest on an immovable basis. As a consequence, this apostle ceased to appear an innovator, and became the faithful expositor of the teaching of Jesus. To write a Gospel with this view was to introduce beneath the vast ecclesiastical edifice raised by Paul, the only foundation which could in the end prevent it from falling. For whatever there is in the Church that does not emanate from Jesus, holds a usurped and consequently a transitory place. This would be true even of the spiritualism of St. Paul, if it did not proceed from Jesus Christ. Certainly it does not therefore follow, that the acts and words of Jesus which Luke relates, and in which the universalist * tendency of the Gospel is manifested, were invented or modified by him in the interest of this tendency. Is it not important for him, on the contrary, to prove to his readers that this tendency was not infused into the Gospel by Paul, but is a legitimate deduction from the work and teaching of Jesus Christ? The essential truth of this claim will be placed beyond all suspicion when we come to prove, on the one hand, that the author has in no way tried to mutilate the narrative by suppressing those facts which might yield a different tendency from that which he desired to justify; on the other, that the tendency which he favors is inseparable from the course of the facts themselves.

If we have correctly apprehended the meaning of the last words of the prologue, we must expect to find in the third Gospel the counterpart of the first. As that is "A Treatise on the right of Jesus to the Messianic sovereignty of Israel," this is "A Treatise on the right of the heathen to share in the Messianic kingdom founded by Jesus." In regard to the earliest writings on the subject of the Gospel history, we may draw from this preface four important results: 1. The common source from which the earliest written narratives of the history of the ministry of Jesus proceeded was the oral testimony of the apostles—the *διδαχή τῶν ἀποστόλων*, which is spoken of in Acts 2:42 a the daily food dispensed by them to the rising Church. 2. The work of committing this apostolic tradition to writing began early, not later than the period of transition from the first to the second Christian generation; and it was attempted by numerous authors at the same time. Nothing in the text of Luke authorizes us to think, with Gieseler, that this was done only among the Greeks. From the earliest times, the art of writing prevailed among the Jews; children even were not ignorant of it (Judg. 8:14). 3. In composing his Gospel Luke possessed the apostolic tradition, not merely in the oral form in which it circulated in the churches, but also reduced to writing in a considerable number of these early works; and these constituted two distinct sources. 4. But he did not content himself with these two means of information; he made use, in addition, of personal investigations designed to complete, correct, and arrange the materials which he derived from these two sources.

Having obtained these definite results, it only remains to see whether they contain the elements required for the solution of the problem of the origin of our synoptics, and of the composition of our Gospel in particular. We shall examine them for this purpose at the conclusion of the work.

* It is hardly needful to remind readers that the "universalist" of Godet is not a denominational title, but a reference to the offer of the Gospel by Paul and others to all men, as distinguished from the narrowness of Judaizing teachers.—J. H.

FIRST PART.

THE NARRATIVES OF THE INFANCY.

CHAP. 1 : 5, 2 : 52.

BOTH the first and the third Gospel open with a cycle of narratives relating to the birth and childhood of Jesus. These narratives do not appear to have formed part of the tradition bequeathed to the Church by the apostles (ver. 2). At least, neither the Gospel of Mark, the document which appears to correspond most nearly with the type of the primitive preaching, nor the oldest example we have of this early preaching, Peter's discourse in the house of Cornelius (Acts 10 : 37–48), go further back than the ministry of John the Baptist and the baptism of Jesus. The reason, doubtless, for this is, that edification was the sole aim of apostolic preaching. It was intended to lay the foundation of the faith ; and in order to do this, the apostles had only to testify concerning what they had themselves seen and heard during the time they had been with Jesus (John 15 : 27 ; Acts 1 : 21, 22).

But these facts with which their preaching commenced supposed antecedent circumstances. Actual events of such an extraordinary nature could not have happened without preparation. This Jesus, whom Mark himself designates from the outset (1 : 1) as the Son of God, could not have fallen from heaven as a full-grown man of thirty years of age. Just as a botanist, when he admires a new flower, will not rest until he has dug it up by the roots, while an ordinary observer will be satisfied with seeing its blossom ; so among believers, among the Greeks especially, there must have been thoughtful minds—Luke and Theophilus are representatives of such—who felt the need of supplying what the narratives of the official witnesses of the ministry of Jesus were deficient in respecting the origin of this history.

The historical interest itself awakened by faith must have tended to dissipate the obscurity which enveloped the first appearance of a being so exceptional as He who was the subject of the evangelical tradition. In proportion as the first enthusiasm of faith gave place, at the transition period between the first and the second generation of Christians, to careful reflection, this need would be felt with growing intensity. Luke felt constrained to satisfy it in his first two chapters. It is evident that the contents of this "Gospel of the Infancy" proceed neither from apostolic tradition (ver. 2), nor from any of the numerous writings to which allusion is made (ver. 1), but that they are derived from special information which Luke had obtained. It is to these two chapters especially that Luke alludes in the third verse of the prologue (ἄνωθεν, *from the beginning*).

A similar need must have been felt, probably at the same time, in the Jewish-Christian world ; only it arose out of another principle. There was no demand there

for the satisfaction of the historic sense. In those circles, interest in the Messianic question prevailed over all others. They wanted to know whether from the beginning the child, as well as afterward the grown man, had not been divinely pointed out as the Messiah. The first two chapters of St. Matthew are plainly intended to meet this need.

In this way we obtain a natural explanation of the extension of the Gospel history to the first commencement of the life of Jesus, and just in those different directions which are to be observed in our two Gospels.

But does not this imply consequences somewhat unfavorable to the truth of the narratives comprised in these two cycles, Luke 1–2 and Matt. 1–2? It is admitted: 1. That these narratives of the infancy lack the guarantee of apostolic testimony. 2. That the wants which we have pointed out might easily call into activity the Christian imagination, and, in the absence of positive history, seek their satisfaction in legend. These narratives are actually regarded in this light, not only by Strauss or Baur, but even by such men as Meyer, Weizsacker, and Keim, who do not generally avow themselves partisans of the mythical interpretation. What in their view renders these narratives suspicious is their poetical character, and the marvels with which they abound (a great number of angelic appearances and of prophetic songs) the complete silence of the other New Testament writings respecting the miraculous birth (there is no mention of it in Paul, or even in John); certain facts of the subsequent history (the unbelief of the brethren of Jesus and of his own mother) which appear incompatible with the miraculous circumstances of this birth; contradictions between Matthew and Luke on several important points; and lastly, historical errors in Luke's narrative, which may be proved by comparing it with the facts of Jewish and Roman history.

We can only examine these various reasons as we pursue in detail the study of the text. As to the way in which the wants we have indicated were satisfied, we would observe: 1. That it is natural to suppose, since the matter in question was regarded as sacred both by the writers and the Church, that the more simple and reverential process of historical investigation would be employed before having recourse to fiction. It is only at a later stage, when the results obtained by this means are no longer sufficient to satisfy curiosity and a corrupted faith, that invention comes in to the aid of history. The apocryphal Gospels, which made their appearance as early as the end of the first century, indicate the time when this change was in operation. Luke, if we may trust his preface, belongs to the first period, that of investigation. 2. It is evident that Luke himself, on the authority of information which he had obtained, believed in the reality of the facts which he relates in his first two chapters as firmly as in that of all the rest of the Gospel history. His narrative bears numerous marks of its strictly historical character: the course of Abia, the city of Galilee named Nazareth, the city of the hill-country of Juda, where dwelt the parents of John the Baptist, the census of Cyrenius, the eighty-four years' widowhood of Anna the prophetess, the physical and moral growth of Jesus as a child and young man, his return to Nazareth and settlement there—all these details leave us no room to doubt the completely historical sense which the author himself attached to these narratives. If, then, this part lacks the authority of apostolic testimony, it is guaranteed by the religious convictions of the author, and by his personal assurance of the value of the oral or written sources whence he derived his knowledge of these facts.

The Gospel of the Infancy in Luke comprises seven narratives :

1. The announcement of the birth of the forerunner, 1 : 5–25 ; 2. The announcement of the birth of Jesus, 1 : 26–38 ; 3. The visit of Mary to Elizabeth, 1 : 39–56. These three narratives form the first cycle.

4. The birth of the forerunner, 1 : 57–80 ; 5. The birth of Jesus, 2 : 1–20 ; 6. The circumcision and presentation of Jesus, 2 : 21–40. These three narratives form a second cycle.

7. The first journey of Jesus to Jerusalem, 2 : 41–52. This seventh narrative is, as it were, the crown of the two preceding cycles.

FIRST NARRATIVE.—CHAP. 1 : 5–25.

Announcement of the Birth of John the Baptist.

The first words of the narrative bring us back from the midst of Greece, whither we were transported by the prologue, into a completely Jewish world. The very style changes its character. From the fifth verse it is so saturated with Aramaisms that the contrast with the four preceding verses resulting from it obliges us to admit, either that the author artificially modifies his language in order to adapt it to his subject, and so produces an imitation—a refinement of method scarcely probable—or that he is dealing with ancient documents, the Aramaic coloring of which he endeavors to preserve as faithfully as possible. This second supposition alone appears admissible. But it may assume two forms. Either the author simply copies a Greek document which already had the Hebraistic character with which we are struck ; or the document in his hands is in the Aramean tongue, and he translates it into Greek. Bleek maintains the first view. We shall examine, at the seventy-eighth verse of chap. 1, his principal proof. As all the most characteristic peculiarities of Luke's style are found in these two chapters, the second alternative is by this circumstance rendered more probable. But in this case it is asked, Why Luke, translating from the Aramean, did not reproduce his document in purer Greek, as he was perfectly competent to do ; comp. vers. 1–4. And he is blamed for his servility as a translator. It is exactly as if M. de Barante were blamed for preserving with all possible fidelity, in his history of the Dukes of Burgundy, the style of the ancient chronicles from which the contents of his narrative are drawn ; or M. Augustin Thierry, for "having kept as near as he possibly could to the language of the ancient historians."* So far from deserving the blame of his critics, Luke has shown himself a man of exquisite taste, in that he has preserved throughout his narrative all the flavor of the documents he uses, and has availed himself of the incomparable flexibility of the Greek language to reproduce in all their purity of substance and form, and give, as it were, a tracing of the precious documents which had fallen into his hands.

This first narrative describes : 1. The trial of Zacharias and Elizabeth (vers. 5–7). 2. The promise of deliverance (vers. 8–22). 3. The accomplishment of this promise (vers. 23–25).

1. *The Trial :* vers. 5–7.† For 400 years direct communications between the Lord and his people had ceased To the lengthened seed-time of the patriarchal, Mosaic,

* "Histoire de la Conquête d'Angleterre," etc., Introd. p. 9.

† Ver. 5. ℵ. B. C. D. L. X. Z. and some Mnn., *γυνη αυτω*, instead of *η γυνη αυτου*, the reading of T. R. 15 Mjj. the Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique}. Ver. 6. ℵ. B. C. X., *εναντιον*, instead of *ενωπιον*, the reading of T. R. 18 Mjj. the Mnn.

and prophetic periods, had succeeded a season of harvest. A fresh seed-time, the second and last phase of divine revelation, was about to open ; this time God would address Himself to the whole world. But when God begins a new work, He does not scornfully break with the instrument by which the past work has been effected. As it is from the seclusion of a convent that in the middle ages He will take the reformer of the Church, so it is from the loins of an Israelitish priest that he now causes to come forth the man who is to introduce the world to the renovation prepared for it. The temple itself, the centre of the theocracy, becomes the cradle of the new covenant, of the worship in spirit and in truth. There is, then, a divine suitability in the choice both of the actors and theatre of the scene which is about to take place.

The days of Herod (ver. 5) designate the time of this prince's reign. This fact agrees with Matt. 2 : 1 *et seq.*, where the birth of Jesus is also placed in the reign of Herod. It may be inferred from Matt. 2 : 19 that this birth happened quite at the end of this reign. According to Josephus, the death of Herod must have taken place in the spring of the year 750 U.C. Jesus, therefore, must have been born at latest in 749, or quite at the beginning of 750. It follows from this, that in the fifth century our era was fixed at least four years too late.

The title of King of Judea had been decreed to Herod by the Senate on the recommendation of Antony and Octavius. The course of Abia was the eighteenth of the twenty-four courses or ephemeriæ into which, from David's time, the college of priests had been divided (1 Chron. 24 : 10). Each of these classes did duty for eight days, from one Sabbath to another, once every six months (2 Kings 11 : 9). Ἐφημερία, properly daily service ; thence : in rotation, returning on a fixed day ; thence : lastly, the group of persons subject to this rotation. As we know that the day on which the temple of Jerusalem was destroyed was the ninth of the fifth month of the year 823 U.C., that is to say, the 4th of August of the year 70 of our era ; and as, according to the Talmud, it was the first ephemeria which was on duty that day, we may reckon, calculating backward, that in the year which must have preceded that in which Jesus was born, that is to say, probably in 748, the ephemeria of Abia was on duty in the week from the 17th to the 23d of April, and in that from the 3d to the 9th of October. Therefore John the Baptist would be born nine months after one of these two dates, and Jesus six months later, consequently in the month of July, 749, or in the month of January, 750.* In this calculation, however, of the time of year to which the births of John and Jesus should be assigned, everything depends on the determination of the year of the birth of Jesus. But this is a question which is not yet decided with any certainty.

The Hebraistic coloring of the style is seen particularly : 1st, in the expression ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις (בימי) ; 2dly, in the connection of propositions by means of the particle καί, instead of the Greek syntactical construction by means of relative pronouns and conjunctions ; 3dly, in the employment of the verb ἐγένετο in the sense of ויהי. The subject of ἐγένετο is not, as is generally thought, the word ἱερεύς, but rather the verb ἦν, which must be understood in the three following propositions (comp. ver. 8, ἐγένετο ἔλαχε). The Alex. reading, γυνὴ αὐτῷ, which is more uncouth and Hebraistic than ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ, is probably the true reading. The term righteous (ver. 6) indicates general conformity of conduct to the divine precepts ; this quality does not absolutely exclude sin (comp. vers. 18–20). It simply supposes that the man humbly

* "Wieseler, Chronolog. Synopsis der vier Evang." pp. 141–145.

acknowledges his sin, strives to make amends for it, and, aided from on high, struggles against it. The Byz. reading *ἐνώπιον, in the presence, under the eyes of*, appears preferable to the Alexandrian reading *ἐναντίον, in the face of, before.* God and man cannot be represented as being face to face in this passage, where God's judgment on man is in question (see at ver. 8). Ἐνώπιον answers to לִפְנֵי, and expresses the inward reality of this righteousness. The two terms *ἐντολαί* and *δικαιώματα, commandments* and *ordinances*, have been distinguished in different ways. The former appears to us to refer to the more general principles of the moral law—to the Decalogue, for example ; the latter, to the multitude of particular Levitical ordinances. *Δικαίωμα* properly is, what God has declared righteous. As the expression *before God* brings out the inward truth of this righteousness, so the following, *walking in . . .* indicates its perfect fidelity in practice. The term *blameless* no more excludes sin here than Phil. 3 : 6. The well-known description in Rom. 7 explains the sense in which this word must be taken. The germ of concupiscence may exist in the heart, even under the covering of the most complete external obedience.

Ver. 7. In the heart of this truly theocratic family, so worthy of the divine blessing, a grievous want was felt. To have no children was a trial the more deeply felt in Israel, that barrenness was regarded by the Jews as a mark of divine displeasure, according to Gen. 2. *Καθότι* does not signify *because that* exactly, but *in accordance with this, that.* It is one of those terms which, in the New Testament, only occur in Luke's writings (19 : 9, and four times in the Acts). If, therefore, as Bleek thinks, Luke had found these narratives already composed in Greek, he must nevertheless admit that he has modified their style. The last proposition cannot, it appears, depend on *καθότι, seeing that ;* for it would not be logical to say, "They had no children . . . seeing that they were both well stricken in years." So, many make these last words an independent sentence. The position, however, of the verb *ἦσαν* at the end, tends rather to make this phrase depend on *καθότι.* To do this, it suffices to supply a thought : They had no children, and they retained but little hope of having any, seeing that . . ." The expression *προβεβηκότες ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτῶν* is purely Hebraistic (Gen. 18 : 11, 24 : 1 ; Josh. 13 : 1 ; 1 Kings 1 : 1—בּוֹא בִּימִים).

2. *The promise of deliverance :* vers. 8–22. This portion comprises : 1. vers. 8–17, The promise itself ; 2. vers. 18–22, The manner in which it was received.

1. The narrative of the promise includes . the appearance (vers. 8–12), and the message (vers. 13–17), of the angel.

The appearance of the angel : vers. 8–12.* The incense had to be offered, according to the law (Ex. 30 : 7, 8), every morning and evening. There was public prayer three times a day : at nine in the morning (Acts 2 : 15 ?), at noon (Acts 10 : 9), and at three in the afternoon (Acts 3 : 1, 10 : 30.) The first and last of these acts of public prayer coincided with the offering of incense (Jos. Antiq. xiv. 4. 3). In the construction *ἐγένετο ἔλαχε*, the subject of the first verb is the act indicated by the second. Ἔναντι, *in the face of, before*, is suitable here ; for the officiating priest enacts a part in the front of the Divinity. The words, according to the custom of the priest's office (ver. 8), may be referred either to the established rotation of the courses (ver. 8), or to the use of the lot with a view to the assignment of each

* Ver. 8. The Mnn. vary between *εναντι* and *εναντιον*. Ver. 10, ℵ. B. E. and 13 Mjj. put *του λαου* between *ην* and *προσευχομενον* ; while the T. R., with A. C. D. K. Π., put it before *ην*.

day's functions. In both cases, the extraordinary use of the lot would be worthy of mention. The reference of these words to what precedes appears to us more natural; we regard them as a simple amplification of *ἐν τῇ τάξει*: "the order of his course, according to the custom of the priest's office." On the use of the lot Oosterzee rightly observes that it proceeded from this, that nothing in the service of the sanctuary was to be left to man's arbitrary decision. The function of offering incense, which gave the priest the right to enter the holy place, was regarded as the most honorable of all. Further, according to the Talmud, the priest who had obtained it was not permitted to draw the lot a second time in the same week. *Εἰσελθών, having entered*; there was the honor! This fact was at the same time the condition of the whole scene that followed. And that is certainly the reason why this detail, which is correctly understood by itself, is so particularly mentioned. Meyer and Bleek, not apprehending this design, find here an inaccuracy of expression, and maintain that with the infinitive *θυμιάσαι* the author passes by anticipation from the notion of the fact to its historical realization. This is unnecessary; *εἰσελθών* is a pluperfect in reference to *θυμιάσαι*: "It fell to him to offer incense after having entered." The term *ναός*, temple, designates the buildings properly so called, in opposition to the different courts; and the complement *κυρίου, of the Lord*, expresses its character in virtue of which the Lord was about to manifest Himself in this house.

The 10th verse mentions a circumstance which brings out the solemnity of the time, as the preceding circumstance brought out the solemnity of the place. The prayer of the people assembled in the court accompanied the offering of incense. There was a close connection between these two acts. The one was the typical, ideal, and therefore perfectly pure prayer; the other the real prayer, which was inevitably imperfect and defiled. The former covered the latter with its sanctity; the latter communicated to the former its reality and life. Thus they were the complement of each other. Hence their obligatory simultaneousness and their mutual connection are forcibly expressed by the dative *τῇ ὥρᾳ*. The reading which puts *τοῦ λαοῦ* between *ἦν* and *προσευχόμενον* expresses better the essential idea of the proposition contained in this participle.

Ver. 11. Here, with the appearance of the angel, begins the marvellous character of the story which lays it open to the suspicion of criticism. And if, indeed, the Christian dispensation were nothing more than the natural development of the human consciousness advancing by its own laws, we should necessarily and unhesitatingly reject as fictitious this supernatural element, and at the same time everything else in the Gospel of a similar character. But if Christianity was an entirely new beginning (Verny) in history, the second and final creation of man, it was natural that an interposition on so grand a scale should be accompanied by a series of particular interpositions. It was even necessary. For how were the representatives of the ancient order of things, who had to co-operate in the new work, to be initiated into it, and their attachment won to it, except by this means? According to the Scripture, we are surrounded by angels (2 Kings 6 : 17; Ps. 34 : 8), whom God employs to watch over us; but in our ordinary condition we want the sense necessary to perceive their presence. For that, a condition of peculiar receptivity is required. This condition existed in Zacharias at this time. It had been created in him by the solemnity of the place, by the sacredness of the function he was about to perform, by his lively sympathy with all this people who were imploring Heaven for national deliverance, and, last of all, by the experience of his own domestic trial, the feeling of which was to be

painfully revived by the favor about to be shown him. Under the influence of all these circumstances combined, that internal sense which puts man in contact with the higher world was awakened in him. But the necessity of this inward predisposition in no way proves that the vision of Zacharias was merely the result of a high state of moral excitement. Several particulars in the narrative make this explanation inadmissible, particularly these two : the difficulty with which Zacharias puts faith in the promise made to him, and the physical chastisement which is inflicted on him for his unbelief. These facts, in any case, render a simple psychological explanation impossible, and oblige the denier of the objectivity of the appearance to throw himself upon the mythical interpretation. The term *ἀγγελος κυρίου, angel of the Lord,* may be regarded as a kind of proper name, and we may translate *the angel of the Lord,* notwithstanding the absence of the article. But since, when once this personage is introduced, the word angel is preceded by the article (ver. 13), it is more natural to translate here *an angel.* The entrance to the temple facing the east, Zacharias, on entering, had on his right the table of shew-bread, placed on the north side ; on his left the candelabrum, placed on the south side ; and before him the golden altar, which occupied the end of the holy place, in front of the veil that hung between this part of the sanctuary and the Holy of Holies. The expression *on the right side of the altar,* must be explained according to the point of view of Zacharias : the angel stood, therefore, between the altar and the shewbread table. The fear of Zacharias proceeds from the consciousness of sin, which is immediately awakened in the human mind when a supernatural manifestation puts it in direct contact with the divine world. The expression *φόβος ἐπέπεσεν* is a Hebraism (Gen. 15 : 12). Was it morning or evening ? Meyer concludes, from the connection between the entrance of Zacharias into the temple and the drawing of the lot (ver. 9), that it was morning. This proof is not very conclusive. Nevertheless, the supposition of Meyer is in itself the most probable.

The message of the angel : vers. 13–17.* " But the angel said unto him, Fear not, Zacharias : for thy prayer is heard ; and thy wife Elizabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John. 14. And thou shalt have joy and gladness ; and many shall rejoice at his birth. 15. For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink ; and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb. 16. And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God. 17. And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just ; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord."

The angel begins by reassuring Zacharias (ver. 13) ; then he describes the person of the son of Zacharias (vers. 14, 15), and his mission (vers. 16, 17).

In the 13th verse the angel tells Zacharias that he has not come on an errand of judgment, but of favor ; comp. Dan. 10 : 12. The prayer of Zacharias to which the angel alludes would be, in the opinion of many, an entreaty for the advent of the Messiah. This, it is said, is the only solicitude worthy of a priest in such a place and at such a time. But the preceding context (ver. 7) is in no way favorable to this explanation, nor is that which follows (ver. 13^b) ; for the sense of the *καί* is most certainly this : " And so thy wife Elizabeth . . ." Further, the two personal pro-

* Ver. 14. Instead of *γεννησει,* which T. R. reads with G. X. Γ. and several Mun., all the others read *γενεσει.* Ver. 17. B. G. L. V. : *προσελευσεται,* instead of *προελευσεται,* the reading of T. R. with 15 Mjj., etc.

nouns, *σοῦ* and *σοί*, "thy wife shall bear thee," as also the *σοί*, "thou shalt have (ver. 14), prove positively the entirely personal character of the prayer and its answer. The objection that, according to ver. 7, he could no longer expect to have a child, and consequently could not pray with this design exaggerates the meaning of this word. The phrase *καλεῖν ὄνομα* is a Hebraism; it signifies, properly, to call any one by his name. The name Ἰωάννης, John, is composed of יהוה and חנני: Jehovah shows grace. It is not the character of the preaching of this person which is expressed by this name; it belongs to the entire epoch of which his appearance is the signal.

The 14th verse describes the joy which his birth will occasion; it will extend beyond the narrow limits of the family circle, and be spread over a large part of the nation. There is an evident rising toward a climax in this part of the message: 1st, a son; 2d, a son great before God; 3d, the forerunner of the Messiah. Ἀγαλλίασις expresses the transports which a lively emotion of joy produces. The beginning of the fulfilment of this promise is related, vers. 64–66. The reading *γενέσει* is certainly preferable to *γεννήσει*, which is perhaps borrowed from the use of the verb *γεννᾶν* (ver. 13).

The ardor of this private and public joy is justified in the 15th verse by the eminent qualities which this child will possess (*γάρ*). The only greatness which can rejoice the heart of such a man as Zacharias is a greatness which the Lord himself recognizes as such: great before the Lord. This greatness is evidently that which results from personal holiness and the moral authority accompanying it. The two *καί* following may be paraphrased by: *and in fact*. The child is ranked beforehand among that class of specially consecrated men, who may be called the heroes of theocratic religion, the Nazarites. The ordinance respecting the kind of life to be led by these men is found in Num. 6:1–21. The vow of the Nazarite was either temporary or for life. The Old Testament offers us two examples of this second form: Samson (Judg. 13:5–7) and Samuel (1 Sam. 1:11). It was a kind of voluntary lay priesthood. By abstaining from all the comforts and conveniences of civilized life, such as wine, the bath, and cutting the hair, and in this way approaching the state of nature, the Nazarite presented himself to the world as a man filled with a lofty thought, which absorbed all his interest, as the bearer of a word of God which was hidden in his heart (Lange). Σικέρα denotes all kinds of fermented drink extracted from fruit, except that derived from the grape. In place of this means of sensual excitement, John will have a more healthful stimulant, the source of all pure exaltation, the Holy Spirit. The same contrast occurs in Eph. 5:18: "Be not drunk with wine . . . but be filled with the Spirit." And in his case this state will begin from his mother's womb: ἔτι, *even*, is not put for ἤδη, *already*; this word signifies, while he is yet in his mother's womb. The fact related (vers. 41–44) is the beginning of the accomplishment of this promise, but it in no way exhausts its meaning.

Vers. 16, 17. The mission of the child; it is described (ver. 16) in a general and abstract way: *he will bring back, turn*; this is the השיב of the Old Testament. This expression implies that the people are sunk in estrangement from God. The 17th verse specifies and develops this mission. The pronoun *αὐτός*, *he*, brings out prominently the person of John with a view to connect him with the person of the Lord, who is to follow him (*αὐτοῦ*). The relation between these two personages thus set forth is expressed by the two prepositions, *πρό*, *before* (in the verb), and *ἐνώπιον*, *under the eyes of*; he who precedes walks under the eyes of him that comes after him. The

Alex. reading *προσελεύσεται* has no meaning. The pronoun *αὐτοῦ* (before him) has been referred by some directly to the person of the Messiah. An attempt is made to justify this meaning, by saying that this personage is always present to the mind of the Israelite when he says "he." But this meaning is evidently forced; the pronoun *him* can only refer to the principal word of the preceding verse: *the Lord their God.* The prophecy. (Mal. 3 : 1), of which this passage is an exact reproduction, explains it: "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in." According to these words, therefore, in the eyes of the prophet the Messiah is no other than Jehovah himself. For it is Jehovah who speaks in this prophecy. It is He who causes Himself to be preceded in his appearance as the Messiah by a forerunner who receives (4 : 5) the name of Elijah, and who is to prepare His way. It is He who, under the names of Adonaï (the Lord) and the angel of the covenant, comes to take possession of His temple. From the Old as well as the New Testament point of view, the coming of the Messiah is therefore the supreme theophany. Apart from this way of regarding them, the words of Malachi and those of the angel in our 17th verse are inexplicable. See an *αὐτοῦ* very similar to this in the strictly analogous passage, John 12 : 41 (comp. with Isa. 6).

It appears from several passages in the Gospels that the people, with their learned men, expected, before the coming of the Messiah, a personal appearance of Elijah, or of some other prophet like him, probably both (John 1 : 21, 22; Matt. 16 : 14, 17 : 10, 27 : 47). The angel spiritualizes this grossly literal hope: "Thy son shall be another Elijah. The Spirit designates the divine breath in general, and the term *power*, which is added to it, indicates the special character of the Spirit's influence in John, as formerly in Elijah. The preposition *ἐν*, *in*, makes the Holy Spirit the element into which the ministry of John is to strike its roots.

The picture of the effect produced by this ministry is also borrowed from Malachi, who had said: "He shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse." The LXX., and, after their example, many modern interpreters, have applied this description to the re-establishment of domestic peace in Israel. But nothing either in the ministry of Elijah or of John the Baptist had any special aim in this direction. Besides, such a result has no direct connection with the preparation for the work of the Messiah, and bears no proportion to the threat which follows in the prophetic word: "Lest I come and smite the earth with a curse." Lastly, the thought, "and the heart of the children to their fathers," taken in this sense, could not have substituted for it in the discourse of the angel, "and the rebellious to the wisdom of the just," unless we suppose that in every Israelitish family the children are necessarily rebellious and their parents just. Some explain it thus: "He will bring back to God all together, both the hearts of the fathers and those of the children;" but this does violence to the expression employed. Calvin and others give the word heart the sense of feeling: "He will bring back the pious feeling of the fathers [faithful to God] to the present generation [the disobedient children], and turn the latter to the wisdom of the former." But can "to turn their hearts toward" mean "to awaken dispositions in"? For this sense *εἰς* would have been necessary instead of *ἐπί* (*τέκνα*); besides, we cannot give the verb *ἐπιστρέψαι* such a different sense from *ἐπιστρέψει* in ver. 16. The true sense of these words, it seems to me, may be gathered from other prophetic passages, such as these: Isa.

29 : 22, "Jacob shall no more be ashamed, neither shall his face wax pale, when he seeth his children become the work of my hands." Lxiii. 16, "Doubtless Thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not; Thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer!" Abraham and Jacob in the place of their rest, had blushed at the sight of their guilty descendants, and turned away their faces from them; but now they would turn again toward them with satisfaction in consequence of the change produced by the ministry of John. The words of Jesus (John 8 : 56), "Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it, and was glad," proves that there is a reality underlying these poetic images. With this meaning the modification introduced into the second member of the phrase is easily explained. The children who will turn toward their fathers (Malachi), are the Jews of the time of the Messiah, the children of the obedient, who return to the wisdom of the pious patriarchs (Luke). Is not this modification made with a view to enlarge the application of this promise? The expression, the rebellious, may, in fact, comprehend not only the Jews, but also the heathen. The term ἀπειθεῖς, *rebellious*, is applied by Paul (Rom. 11) to both equally. Φρόνησις δικαίων, *the wisdom of the just*, denotes that healthy appreciation of things which is the privilege of upright hearts. The preposition of rest, ἐν, is joined to a verb of motion, ἐπιστρέψαι, to express the fact that this wisdom is a state in which men remain when once they have entered it. It will be John's mission, then, to reconstitute the moral unity of the people by restoring the broken relation between the patriarchs and their descendants. The withered branches will be quickened into new life by sap proceeding from the trunk. This restoration of the unity of the elect people will be their true preparation for the coming of the Messiah. Some interpreters have proposed to make ἀπειθεῖς the object of ἑτοιμάσαι, and this last a second infinitive of purpose, parallel to ἐπιστρέψαι: "And to prepare by the wisdom of the just, the rebellious, as a people made ready for the Lord." It is thought that in this way a tautology is avoided between the two words ἑτοιμάσαι, *to prepare*, and κατεσκευασμένον, *made ready, disposed*. But these two terms have distinct meanings. The first bears on the relation of John to the people; the second on the relation of the people to the Messiah. John prepares the people in such a way that they are disposed to receive the Messiah. Of course it is the ideal task of the forerunner that is described here. In reality this plan will succeed only in so far as the people shall consent to surrender themselves to the divine action. Is it probable that after the ministry of Jesus, when the unbelief of the people was already an historical fact, a later writer would have thought of giving such an optimist coloring to the discourse of the angel?

2. Vers. 18–22 relate the manner in which the promise is received; and first, the objection of Zacharias (ver. 18); next, his punishment (vers. 19, 20); lastly, the effect produced upon the people by this latter circumstance.

Vers. 18–20. "And Zacharias said unto the angel, Whereby shall I know this? for I am an old man, and my wife well stricken in years. And the angel answering, said unto him, I am Gabriel that stand in the presence of God; and am sent to speak unto thee, and to show thee these glad tidings. And, behold, thou shalt be dumb, and not able to speak, until the day that these things shall be performed, because thou believest not my words, which shall be fulfilled in their season." Abraham, Gideon, and Hezekiah had asked for signs (Gen. 15; Judg. 6; 2 Kings 20) without being blamed. God had of Himself granted one to Moses (Ex. 4), and offered one to Ahaz (Isa. 7). Why, if this was lawful in all these cases, was it not so in this?

There is a maxim of human law which says, *Si duo faciunt idem, non est idem.* There are different degrees of responsibility, either according to the degree of development of the individual or of the age, or according to the character of the divine manifestation. God alone can determine these degrees. It appears from the 19th verse that the appearance of the being who spoke to Zacharias ought of itself to have been a sufficient sign. In any case this difference from the similar accounts in the Old Testament proves that our narrative was not artificially drawn up in imitation of them. The sign requested is designated by the preposition *κατά*, *according to*, as the norm of knowledge. The *γάρ*, *for*, refers to this idea understood : I have need of such a sign. Yet Zacharias prayed for this very thing which now, when promised by God, appears impossible to him. It is an inconsistency, but one in keeping with the laws of our moral nature. The narrative, Acts 12, in which we see the church of Jerusalem praying for the deliverance of Peter, and refusing to believe it when granted, presents a similar case.

In order to make Zacharias feel the seriousness of his fault, the angel (ver. 19) refers to two things : his dignity as a divine messenger, and the nature of his message. Ἐγώ, *I*, coming first, brings his person into prominence. But he immediately adds, *that stand in the presence of God*, to show that it is not he who is offended, but God who has sent him. The name Gabriel is composed of גבר and אל : *vir Dei*, the mighty messenger of God. The Bible knows of only two heavenly personages who are invested with a name, Gabriel (Dan. 8 : 16, 9 : 21) and Michael (Dan. 10 : 13, 21 ; 12 : 1 ; Jude 9 ; Rev. 12 : 7). This latter name (מיכאל) signifies, *who is like God?* Here the critic asks sarcastically whether Hebrew is spoken in heaven? But these names are evidently symbolical ; they convey to us the character and functions of these personalities. When we speak to any one, it is naturally with a view to be understood. When heaven communicates with earth, it is obliged to borrow the language of earth. According to the name given him, Gabriel is the mighty servant of God employed to promote His work here below. It is in this capacity that he appears to Daniel, when he comes to announce to him the restoration of Jerusalem ; it is he also who promises Mary the birth of the Saviour. In all these circumstances he appears as the heavenly evangelist. The part of Gabriel is positive ; that of Michael is negative. Michael is, as his name indicates, the destroyer of every one who dares to equal, that is, to oppose God. Such is his mission in Daniel, where he contends against the powers hostile to Israel ; such also is it in Jude and in the Apocalypse, where he fights, as the champion of God, against Satan, the author of idolatry : Gabriel builds up, Michael overthrows. The former is the forerunner of Jehovah the Saviour, the latter of Jehovah the Judge. Do not these two heavenly personages remind us of the two angels who accompanied Jehovah (Gen. 18) when He came to announce to Abraham, on the one hand, the birth of Isaac, and, on the other, the destruction of Sodom? Biblical angelology makes mention of no other persons belonging to the upper world. But this wise sobriety did not satisfy later Judaism ; it knew besides an angel Uriel, who gives good counsel, and an angel Raphael, who works bodily cures. The Persian angelology is richer still. It reckons no less than seven superior spirits or amschaspands. How, then, can it be maintained that the Jewish angelology is a Persian importation? History does not advance from the complicated to the simple. Besides, the narrative, Gen. 18, in which the two archangels appear, is prior to the contact of Israel with the Persian religion. Lastly, the idea represented by these two personages is essentially Jewish. These two

notions, of a work of grace personified in Gabriel, and of a work of judgment personified in Michael, have their roots in the depths of Jewish monotheism. The term *to stand before God* indicates a permanent function (Isa. 6 : 2). This messenger is one of the servants of God nearest His throne. This superior dignity necessarily rests on a higher degree of holiness. We may compare 1 Kings 17 : 1, where Elijah says, "The Lord before whom I stand." Jesus expresses Himself in a similar manner (Matt. 18) respecting the guardian angels of the little ones : "Their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." Such a being deserves to be taken at his word ; how much more when he is the bearer of a message which is to fulfil the desires of him to whom he is sent, and answer his earnest supplication (ver. 19[b])!

The chastisement inflicted on Zacharias (ver. 20) is at the same time to serve as a sign to him. Ἰδού, *behold*, indicates the unexpected character of this dispensation. Σιωπῶν, *not speaking*, denotes simply the fact ; μὴ δυνάμενος, *not being able to speak*, discloses its cause ; this silence will not be voluntary. Οἵτινες, *which, as such*, that is to say, as being the words of such a being as I am. It may seem that with the future *shall be fulfilled*, the preposition ἐν is required, and not εἰς. But εἰς indicates that the performance of the promise will begin immediately in order to its completion at the appointed time ; comp. Rom. 6 : 22, εἰς ἁγιασμόν. Καιρός, *their season*, refers not only to the time (χρόνος), but to the entire circumstances in which this fulfilment will take place. There is not a word in this speech of the angel which is not at once simple and worthy of the mouth into which it is put. It is not after this fashion that man makes heaven speak when he is inventing ; only read the apocryphal writings!

Vers. 21 and 22. According to the Talmud, the high priest did not remain long in the holy of holies on the great day of atonement. Much more would this be true of the priest officiating daily in the holy place. The analytical form ἦν προσδοκῶν depicts the lengthened expectation and uneasiness which began to take possession of the people. The text indicates that the events which had just taken place was made known in two ways : on the one hand, by the silence of Zacharias ; on the other, by signs by which he himself (αὐτός) indicated its cause. The analytical form ἦν διανεύων denotes the frequent repetition of the same signs, and the imperfect διέμενεν, *he remained dumb*, depicts the increasing surprise produced by his continuing in this state.

3. *The accomplishment of the promise :* vers. 23–25. The subject of ἐγένετο, *it came to pass*, is all that follows to the end of ver. 25. Comp a similar ἐγένετο, Acts 9 : 3. The active form περιέκρυβεν ἑαυτήν, literally, *she kept herself concealed*, expresses a more energetic action than that designated by the middle περιεκρύψατο. Elizabeth isolated herself intentionally, rendering herself invisible to her neighbors. Her conduct has been explained in many ways. Origen and Ambrose thought that it was the result of a kind of false modesty. Paulus supposed that Elizabeth wished to obtain assurance of the reality of her happiness before speaking about it. According to De Wette, this retreat was nothing more than a precaution for her health. It was dictated, according to Bleek and Oosterzee, by a desire for meditation and by sentiments of humble gratitude. Of all these explanations, the last certainly appears the best. But it in no way accounts for the term for five months, so particularly mentioned. Further, how from this point of view are we to explain the singular expression, *Thus* hath the Lord dealt with me? The full meaning of this word *thus* is necessarily weakened by applying it in a general way to the greatness of the blessing conferred

on Elizabeth, while this expression naturally establishes a connection between the practice she pursues toward herself from this time, and God's method of dealing with her. What is this connection? Does she not mean, "I will treat myself as God has treated my reproach. He has taken it away from me; I will therefore withdraw myself from the sight of men, so long as I run any risk of still bearing it, when I am in reality delivered from it?" Restored by God, she feels that she owes it to herself, as well as to Him who has honored her in this way, to expose herself no more to the scornful regards of men until she can appear before them evidently honored by the proofs of the divine favor. In this way the term five months, which she fixes for her seclusion, becomes perfectly intelligible For it is after the fifth month that the condition of a pregnant woman becomes apparent. Therefore it is not until then that she can appear again in society, as what she really is, restored. In this conduct and declaration there is a mixture of womanly pride and humble gratitude which makes them a very exquisite expression of maternal feeling for one in such a position. We should like to know what later narrator would have invented such a delicate touch as this. But the authenticity of this single detail implies the authenticity of the whole of the preceding narrative.* Ὅτι must be taken here in the sense of *because;* Elizabeth wants to justify whatever is unusual in the course of conduct she has just adopted. Ἐπεῖδεν ἀφελεῖν, "He has regarded me in a manner that takes away;" he has cast on me one of those efficacious looks which, as the Psalmist says, are deliverance itself. On barrenness as a reproach, comp. Gen. 30 : 23, where, after the birth of her first-born, Rachel cries, "God has taken away my reproach."

This saying of Elizabeth's discloses all the humiliations which the pious Israelite had endured from her neighbors during these long years of barrenness. This also comes out indirectly from ver. 36, in which the angel makes use of the expression, "Her who was called barren." This epithet had become a kind of sobriquet for her in the mouth of the people of the place.

SECOND NARRATIVE.—CHAP. 1 : 26–38.

Announcement of the Birth of Jesus.

The birth of John the Baptist, like that of Isaac, was due to a higher power; but it did not certainly transcend the limits of the natural order. It is otherwise with the birth of Jesus; it has the character of a creative act. In importance it constitutes the counterpart, not of the birth of Isaac, but of the appearance of the first man; Jesus is the second Adam. This birth is the beginning of the world to come. If this character of the appearance of Jesus be denied, the whole of the subsequent narrative remains unintelligible and inadmissible. Directly it is conceded, all the rest accords with it.

But the creative character of this birth does not destroy the connection between the old and the new era. We have just seen how, in the birth of the greatest representative of the old covenant, God remained faithful to the theocratic past, by making the Israelitish priesthood the cradle of this child. He acts in the same way when the

* For this beautiful explanation I am indebted to the friend to whom I have had the joy of dedicating my commentary on the Gospel of John, and with whom I have more than once read the Gospel of Luke, Professor Charles Prince, who now beholds face to face Him whom we have so often contemplated together in the mirror of His word. Generally speaking, this commentary is as much h s as mine.

Head of renewed humanity, the Lord of the world to come, is to make His appearance; He causes Him to come forth as a scion from the stock of the ancient royalty of Israel. Further, God has respect in this work to the conditions of the human past generally. While creating in Him a new humanity, He is careful to preserve the link which unites Him to the ancient humanity. Just as in the first creation He did not create man's body out of nothing, but formed it out of the dust of the already existing earth, of which Adam was to become the lord; so, at the appearance of the second Adam, He did not properly create His body; He took it from the womb of a human mother, so as to maintain the organic connection which must exist between the Head of the new humanity and that natural humanity which it is His mission to raise to the height of His own stature.

This narrative records: 1. The appearance of the angel (vers. 26–29); 2. His message (vers. 30–33); 3. The manner in which his message is received (ver. 34–38).

1. *The appearance of the angel:* vers. 26–29.* From the temple the narrative transports us to the house of a young Israelitish woman. We leave the sphere of official station to enter into the seclusion of private life. Mary probably was in prayer. Her chamber is a sanctuary; such, henceforth, will be the true temple. The date, the sixth month, refers to that given in ver. 24. It was the time when Elizabeth had just left her retirement; all that takes place in the visitation of Mary is in connection with this circumstance. The government ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, *by God*, or, as some Alex. read, ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, *on the part of God*, indicates a difference between this message and that in ver. 19. God interposes more directly; it is a question here of His own Son. The received reading ὑπο, *by*, seems to me for this reason more in accordance with the spirit of the context than the Alex. reading, which lays less emphasis on the divine origin of the message.

The most usual form of the name of the town in the documents is Nazareth: it is admitted here by Tischendorf in his eighth edition. He accords, however, some probability to the form Nazara, which is the reading of 4:16 in the principal Alexandrians. In Matt. 3:23, the MSS. only vary between Nazareth and Nazaret. Keim, in his "History of Jesus," has decided for Nazara. He gives his reasons, i. p. 319 *et seq*: 1. The derived adjectives Ναζωραῖος, Ναζαρηνός are most readily explained from this form. 2. The form Nazareth could easily come from Nazara, as Ramath from Rama (by the addition of the Aramean article). The forms Nazareth and Nazaret may also be explained as forms derived from that. 3. The phrase ἀπὸ Ναζάρων, in Eusebius, supposes the nominative Nazara. 4. It is the form preserved in the existing Arabic name en-Nezirah. Still it would be possible, even though the true name was Nazara, that Luke might have been accustomed to use the form Nazareth; Tischendorf thinks that this may be inferred from Acts 10:38, where ℵ. B. C. D. E. read Nazareth. The etymology of this name is probably נאר (whence the feminine

* Ver. 26. ℵ. B. L. W^{e}. and some Mnn., απο instead of υπο, which is the reading of T. R. with 16 Mjj. and almost all the Mnn. The MSS. vary here between Ναζαρεθ (C. E. G. H. M. S. U. V. Γ. Δ. Λ. It^{plerique}; in addition, ℵ. at 2:4, and B. at 2:39, 51), Ναζαραθ (A. Δ.), and Ναζαρετ (K. L. X. Π and Z. at 2:4); further, ℵ. B. Z. read Ναζαρα at 4:16. Ver. 27. ℵ. B. F^{w}. L. and 32 Mnn. add after οικου, και πατριας (taken from 2:4). Ver. 28. ℵ. B. L. W^{c}. and some Mnn. omit the words ευλογημενη συ εν γυναιξιν, which is the reading of T. R. with 16 Mjj., almost all the Mnn., Syr. It. Vulg. Ver. 29. ℵ. B. D. L. X. and some Mnn. omit ιδουσα, which T. R. reads after η δε along with 15 Mjj., the other Mnn., Syr. It. ℵ. B. D. L. X. and some Mnn. omit αυτου after λογω.

form נצרת), *a shoot or scion;* this is the form used in the Talmud. The Fathers accordingly perceived in this name an allusion to the scion of David in the prophets. Burckhardt the traveller explains it more simply by the numerous shrubs which clothe the ground. Hitzig has proposed another etymology; נוצרת, *the guardian*, the name referring either to some pagan divinity, the protectress of the locality, as this scholar thinks, or, as Keim supposes, to the town itself, on account of its commanding the defile of the valley.

Nazareth, with a population at the present day of 3000 inhabitants, is about three days' journey north of Jerusalem, and about eight leagues west of Tiberias. It is only a short distance from Tabor. It is reached from the valley of Jezreel through a mountain gorge running from S. to N., and opening out into a pleasant basin of some twenty minutes in length by ten in width. A chain of hills shuts in the valley on its northern side. Nazareth occupies its lower slopes, and rises in smiling terraces above the valley. From the summit of the ridge which incloses this basin on the north there is a splendid view.* This valley was in Israel just what Israel was in the midst of the earth—a place at once secluded and open, a solitary retreat and a high post of observation, inviting meditation and at the same time affording opportunity for far reaching views in all directions, consequently admirably adapted for an education of which God reserved to Himself the initiative, and which man could not touch without spoiling it. The explanation, *a town of Galilee*, is evidently intended for Gentile readers; it is added by the translator to the Jewish document that lay before him.

Do the words, *of the house of David*, ver. 27, refer to Joseph or Mary? Grammatically, it appears to us that the form of the following sentence rather favors the former alternative. For if this clause applied, in the writer's mind, to Mary, he would have continued his narrative in this form: "and her name was . . ." rather than in this: "and the young girl's name was . . ." But does it follow from this that Mary was not, in Luke's opinion, a descendant of David? By no means. Vers. 32 and 69 have no sense unless the author regarded Mary herself as a daughter of this king. See 3 : 23.

The term *χαριτοῦν τινα*, to make any one the object of one's favor, is applied to believers in general (Eph. 1 : 6). There is no thought here of outward graces, as the translation *full of grace* would imply. The angel, having designated Mary by this expression as the special object of divine favor, justifies this address by the words which follow: *The Lord with thee.* Supply *is*, and not *be;* it is not a wish. The heavenly visitant speaks as one knowing how matters stood. The words, "Blessed art thou among women," are not genuine; they are taken from ver. 42, where they are not wanting in any document.

The impression made on Mary, ver. 29, is not that of fear; it is a troubled feeling, very natural in a young girl who is suddenly made aware of the unexpected presence of a strange person. The T. R. indicates two causes of trouble: "And when she saw him, she was troubled at his saying." By the omission of *ἰδοῦσα, when she saw*, the Alexs. leave only one remaining. But this very simplification casts suspicion on their reading. The two ancient Syriac and Latin translations here agree with the T. R. The meaning is, that trouble was joined to the surprise caused by the sight of the angel, as soon as his words had confirmed the reality of his presence. Ποταπός

* See Keim's fine description, "Gesch. Jesu," t. i. p. 321.

denotes properly the origin (*ποῦ τὸ ἀπό*). But this term applies also to the contents and value, as is the case here. *What was the meaning, the import of* . . . Having thus prepared Mary, the angel proceeds with the message he has brought.

2. The message of the angel: vers. 30–33.* "And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary; for thou hast found favor with God. 31. And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call His name Jesus. 32. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David: 33. And He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of His kingdom there shall be no end." By long continuance, Mary's trouble would have degenerated into fear. The angel prevents this painful impression: "Fear not." The term *εὗρες χάριν, thou hast found favor*, reproduces the idea of *κεχαριτωμένη*; this expression belongs to the Greek of the LXX. The angel proceeds to enumerate the striking proofs of this assertion, the marks of divine favor: 1st, a son; 2d, His name, a sign of blessing; 3d, His personal superiority; 4th, His divine title; lastly, His future and eternal sovereignty. *Ἰδού*, behold, expresses the unexpected character of the fact announced. *Ἰησοῦς, Jesus*, is the Greek form of ישוע, Jeschovah, which was gradually substituted for the older and fuller form יהושוע, Jehoschovah, of which the meaning is, Jehovah saves. The same command is given by the angel to Joseph, Matt. 1 : 21, with this comment: "For He shall save His people from their sins." Criticism sees here the proof of two different and contradictory traditions. But if the reality of these two divine messages is admitted, there is nothing surprising in their agreement on this point. As to the two traditions, we leave them until we come to the general considerations at the end of chap. 2. The personal quality of this son: He shall be great—first of all, in holiness; this is true greatness in the judgment of Heaven; then, and as a consequence, in power and influence. His title: Son of the Highest. This title corresponds with His real nature. For the expression, *He shall be called*, signifies here, universally recognized as such, and that because He is such in fact. This title has been regarded as a simple synonym for that of Messiah. But the passages cited in proof, Matt. 26 : 63 and John 1 : 50, prove precisely the contrary: the first, because had the title Son of God signified nothing more in the view of the Sanhedrim than that of Messiah, there would have been no blasphemy in assuming it, even falsely; the second, because it would be idle to put two titles together between which there was no difference.† On the other hand, the Trinitarian sense should not be here applied to the term Son of God. The notion of the pre-existence of Jesus Christ, as the eternal Son of God, is quite foreign to the context. Mary could not have comprehended it; and on the supposition that she had comprehended or even caught a glimpse of it, so far from being sustained by it in her work as a mother, she would have been rendered incapable of performing it. The notion here expressed by the title Son of God is solely that of a personal and mysterious relation between this child and the Divine Being. The angel explains more clearly the meaning of this term in ver. 35. Lastly, the dignity and mission of this child: He is to fulfil the office of Messiah. The expressions are borrowed from the prophetic descriptions, 2 Sam. 7 : 12, 13; Isa. 9 : 5–7. The throne of David should not be taken here as the emblem of the throne of God, nor the house of Jacob

* Ver. 30. D. alone reads *μαρια* instead of *μαριαμ*; so at vers. 39, 56, and (with C., at vers. 34, 38, 46, 2 : 19, the MSS. are divided between these two readings.

† See my "Conférences apologétiques," 6th conférence: the divinity of Jesus Christ, pp. 15–18.

as a figurative designation of the Church. These expressions in the mouth of the angel keep their natural and literal sense. It is, indeed, the theocratic royalty and the Israelitish people, neither more nor less, that are in question here; Mary could have understood these expressions in no other way. It is true that, for the promise to be realized in this sense, Israel must have consented to welcome Jesus as their Messiah. In that case, the transformed theocracy would have opened its bosom to the heathen; and the empire of Israel would have assumed, by the very fact of this incorporation, the character of a universal monarchy. The unbelief of Israel foiled this plan, and subverted the regular course of history; so that at the present day the fulfilment of these promises is still postponed to the future. But is it likely, after the failure of the ministry of Jesus among this people, that about the beginning of the second century, when the fall of Jerusalem had already taken place, any writer would have made an angel prophesy what is expressed here? This picture of the Messianic work could have been produced at no other epoch than that to which this narrative refers it—at the transition period between the old and new covenants. Besides, would it have been possible, at any later period, to reproduce, with such artless simplicity and freshness, the hopes of these early days?

3. The manner in which the message was received: vers. 34–38.* "34. Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? 35. And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. 36. And, behold, thy cousin Elizabeth, she hath also conceived a son in her old age; and this is the sixth month with her, who was called barren. 37. For with God nothing shall be impossible. 38. And Mary said, Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word. And the angel departed from her." Mary's question does not express doubt: it simply asks for an explanation, and this very request implies faith. Her question is the legitimate expression of the astonishment of a pure conscience. We observe in the angel's reply the parallelism which among the Hebrews is always the expression of exalted feeling and the mark of the poetic style. The angel touches upon the most sacred of mysteries, and his speech becomes a song. Are the terms *come upon, overshadow*, borrowed, as Bleek thinks, from the image of a bird covering her eggs or brooding over her young? Comp. Gen. 1 : 3. It appears to us rather that these expressions allude to the cloud which covered the camp of the Israelites in the desert. In 9 : 34, as here, the evangelist describes the approach of this mysterious cloud by the term ἐπισκιάζειν. The Holy Ghost denotes here the divine power, the life-giving breath which calls into developed existence the germ of a human personality slumbering in Mary's womb. This germ is the link which unites Jesus to human nature, and makes Him a member of the race He comes to save. Thus in this birth the miracle of the first creation is repeated on a scale of greater power. Two elements concurred in the formation of man: a body taken from the ground, and the divine breath. With these two elements correspond here the germ derived from the womb of Mary, and the Holy Ghost who fertilizes it. The absolute purity

* Ver. 34. Some Mjj. Mnn. Vss. and Fathers add μοι to εσται. Ver. 35. C. several Mnn. It. add εκ σου after γεννωμενον. Ver. 36. Instead of συγγενης, 9 Mjj. several Mnn. read συγγενις. Instead of συνειληφυια, the reading of T. R. with 16 Mjj., the Mnn. Syr., ℵ. B. L. Z., συνειληφιν. Ver. 37. Instead of παρα τω Θεω, ℵ. B. L. Z., παρα του Θεου.

of this birth results on the one hand, from the perfect holiness of the divine principle which is its efficient cause; on the other, from the absence of every impure motion in her who becomes a mother under the power of such a principle.

By the word *also* ("therefore *also*") the angel alludes to his preceding words: He shall be called the Son of the Highest. We might paraphrase it: "And it is precisely for this reason that I said to thee, that . . ." We have then here, from the mouth of the angel himself, an authentic explanation of the term "Son of God" in the former part of his message. After this explanation, Mary could only understand the title in this sense: a human being of whose existence God Himself is the immediate author. It does not convey the idea of pre-existence, but it implies more than the term Messiah, which only refers to His mission. The word ὑψίστου, *of the High st*, also refers to the term υἱὸς ὑψίστου, *Son of the Highest*, ver. 32, and explains it. Bleek, following the *Peschito*, Tertullian, etc., makes ἅγιον the predicate of κληθήσεται, and υἱὸς Θεοῦ in apposition with ἅγιον: "Wherefore that which shall be born of thee shall be called holy, Son of God." But with the predicate *holy*, the verb should have been, not "*shall* be called," but *shall be*. For *holy* is not a title. Besides, the connection with ver. 32 will not allow any other predicate to be given to *shall be called* the *Son of God*. The subject of the phrase is therefore the complex term τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον, *the holy thing conceived in thee*, and more especially ἅγιον, *the holy*; this adjective is taken as a substantive. As the adjective of γεννώμενον, taken substantively, it would of necessity be preceded by the article. The words ἐκ σοῦ are a gloss. What is the connection between this miraculous birth of Jesus and His perfect holiness? The latter does not necessarily result from the former. For holiness is a fact of volition, not of nature. How could we assign any serious meaning to the moral struggles in the history of Jesus—the temptation, for example—if His perfect holiness was the necessary consequence of His miraculous birth? But it is not so. The miraculous birth was only the *negative* condition of the spotless holiness of Jesus. Entering into human life in this way, He was placed in the normal condition of man before his fall, and put in a position to fulfil the career originally set before man, in which he was to advance from innocence to holiness. He was simply freed from the obstacle which, owing to the way in which we are born, hinders us from accomplishing this task, but in order to change this possibility into a reality, Jesus had to exert every instant His own free will, and to devote Himself continually to the service of good and the fulfilment of the task assigned Him, namely, "the keeping of His Father's commandment." His miraculous birth, therefore, in no way prevented this conflict from being real. It gave Him liberty *not to sin*, but did not take away from Him the liberty of sinning.

Mary did not ask for a sign; the angel gives her one of his own accord. This sign, it is clear, is in close connection with the promise just made to her. When she beholds in Elizabeth the realization of this promised sign, her faith will be thoroughly confirmed. Ἰδού, *behold*, expresses its unexpectedness. Καί before αὐτή, *she also*, brings out the analogy between the two facts thus brought together. Mary's being related to Elizabeth in no way proves, as Schleiermacher thought, that Mary did not belong to the tribe of Judah. There was no law to oblige an Israelitish maiden to marry into her own tribe;* Mary's father, even if he was of the tribe of Judah, might therefore have espoused a woman of the tribe of Levi. Could it be from this passage

* Unless when land was possessed, and she desired to retain it. See Numb. 36 : 6–8.—J. H.

that Keim derives his assertion, that the priestly origin of Mary is indicated in Luke (i. 334)? The dative *γήρᾳ* in the T. R. is only found in some MSS. All the other documents have *γῆρει*, from the form *γῆρος*.

In ver. 37 the angel refers the two events thus announced to to the common cause which explains them both—the boundless omnipotence of God. That is the rock of faith. Ἀδυνατεῖν signifies, properly, *to be powerless*. And Meyer maintains that this must be its meaning here, and that *ῥῆμα* is to be taken in its proper sense of *word*. In that case we should have to give the preference to the Alex. reading *τοῦ Θεοῦ*: "No word proceeding from God shall remain powerless." But this meaning is far-fetched. Παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ cannot depend naturally either on *ῥῆμα* or *ἀδυνατήσει*. Matt. 17 : 20 proves that the verb *ἀδυνατεῖν* also signifies, in the Hellenistic dialect, *to be impossible*. The sense therefore is, "Nothing shall be impossible." Παρὰ *τῷ Θεῷ*, *with God*, indicates the sphere in which alone this word is true. As though the angel said, The *impossible* is not divine. Ῥῆμα, as דָּבָר, *a thing*, in so far as announced. In reference to this concise vigorous expression of biblical supernaturalism, Oosterzee says: "The laws of nature are not chains which the Divine Legislator has laid upon Himself; they are threads which He holds in His hand, and which He shortens or lengthens at will."

God's message by the mouth of the angel was not a command. The part Mary had to fulfil made no demands on her. It only remained, therefore, for Mary to consent to the consequences of the divine offer. She gives this consent in a word at once simple and sublime, which involved the most extraordinary act of faith that a woman ever consented to accomplish. Mary accepts the sacrifice of that which is dearer to a young maiden than her very life, and thereby becomes pre-eminently the heroine of Israel, the ideal daughter of Zion, the perfect type of human receptivity in regard to the divine work. We see here what exquisite fruits the lengthened work of the Holy Spirit under the old covenant had produced in true Israelites. The word *ἰδού, behold*, does not here express surprise, but rather the offer of her entire being. Just as Abraham, when he answers God with, "Behold, here I am" (Gen. 22, Behold, I), Mary places herself at God's disposal. The evangelist shows his tact in the choice of the aorist *γένοιτο*. The present would have signified, "Let it happen to me this very instant!" The aorist leaves the choice of the time to God.

What exquisite delicacy this scene displays! What simplicity and majesty in the dialogue! Not one word too many, not one too few. A narrative so perfect could only have emanated from the holy sphere within which the mystery was accomplished. A later origin would inevitably have betrayed itself by some foreign element. Here the *Protevangelium* of James, which dates from the first part of the second century: "Fear not, said the angel to Mary; for thou hast found grace before the Master of all things, and thou shalt conceive by His word. Having heard that, she doubted and said within herself: Shall I conceive of the Lord, of the living God, and shall I give birth as every woman gives birth? And the angel of the Lord said to her, No, not thus, Mary, for the power of God . . ." etc.

THIRD NARRATIVE.—CHAP. 1 : 39–56.

Mary's Visit to Elizabeth.

This narrative is, as it were, the synthesis of the two preceding. These two divinely favored women meet and pour forth their hearts.

1. Arrival of Mary (vers. 39–41) ; 2. Elizabeth's salutation (vers. 42–45) ; 3. Song of Mary (vers. 46–55). Ver. 56 forms the historical conclusion.

1. *The arrival of Mary ;* vers. 39–41.* The terms *arose* and *with haste* express a lively eagerness. This visit met what was in fact a deep need of Mary's soul. Since the message of the angel, Elizabeth had become for her what a mother is for her daughter in the most important moment of her life. The words *in those days* comprise the time necessary for making preparations for the journey. The distance to be traversed being four days' journey, Mary could not travel so far alone. The word ἡ ὀρεινή, *the hill country*, has sometimes received quite a special meaning, making it a kind of proper name, by which in popular language the mountainous p ateau to the south of Jerusalem was designated ; but no instance of a similar designation can be given either from the Old or the New Testament. It appears to me that in this expression, "a city of Juda in the mountain," it is in no way necessary to give the term mountain the force of a proper name. The context makes it sufficiently clear that it is the mountain *of Juda*, in distinction from the plain *of Juda*, that is meant. Comp. Josh. 15 : 48, where ἡ ὀρεινή is employed precisely in this way by the LXX. According to Josh. 15 : 55, 21 : 16, there was in this country, to the south of Hebron, a city of the name of *Jutha* or *Juttha ;* and according to the second passage (comp. ver. 13), this city was a priestly city.† From this several writers (Reland, Winer, Rénan) have concluded that the text of our Gospel has undergone an alteration, and that the word *Juda* is a corruption of *Jutha*. But no MS. supports this conjecture ; and there is nothing in the context to require it. On the contrary, it is probable that, had Luke desired to indicate by name the city in which the parents of John the Baptist lived, he would have done it sooner. The most important priestly city of this country was Hebron, two leagues south of Bethlehem. And although, subsequent to the exile, the priests no longer made it a rule to reside exclusively in the towns that had been assigned to them at the beginning, it is very natural to look for the home of Zacharias at Hebron, the more so that rabbinical tradition in the Talmud gives express testimony in favor of this opinion.‡ Keim finds further support for it on this ground, that in the context πόλις Ἰούδα can only signify *the* city of Juda, that is to say, the principal priestly city in Juda. But wrongly ; the simplest and most natural translation is : *a* city of Juda.

The detail, *she entered into the house*, serves to put the reader in sympathy with the emotion of Mary at the moment of her arrival. With her first glance at Elizabeth she recognizes the truth of the sign that had been given her by the angel, and at this sight the promise she had herself received acquires a startling reality. Often a very little thing suffices to make a divine thought, which had previously only been conceived as an idea, take distinct form and life within us. And the expression we have used is perhaps, in this case, more than a simple metaphor. It is not surprising that the intense feeling produced in Mary by the sight of Elizabeth should have reacted immediately on the latter. The unexpected arrival of this young maiden at such a solemn moment for herself, the connection which she instantly divines between the miraculous blessing of which she had just been the object and this extraordinary visit, the affecting tones of the voice and holy elevation of this person, producing all the

* Ver. 40, ℵ and some Mnn., add εν αγαλλιασει after βρεφος (taken from ver. 44).

† According to Robinson, it is at the present day a village named *Jutta*. The name in the LXX. is *Ita*.

‡ Othon, "Lexicon rabbinicum," p. 324.

impression of some celestial apparition, naturally predisposed her to receive the illumination of the Spirit. The emotion which possesses her is communicated to the child whose life is as yet one with her own ; and at the sudden leaping of this being, who she knows is compassed about by special blessing, the veil is rent. The Holy Spirit, the prophetic Spirit of the old covenant, seizes her, and she salutes Mary as the mother of the Messiah.

2. The salutation of Elizabeth : vers. 42–45.* "And she spake out with a loud voice, and said, Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. 43. And whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me? 44 For, lo, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in mine ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy. 45 And blessed is she that believed : for there shall be a performance of those things which were told her from the Lord." The course of Elizabeth's thought is this : first of all, Mary and the son of Mary (ver. 42) ; next Elizabeth herself and her son (vers. 43, 44) ; lastly, Mary and her happiness. The characteristic of all true action of the Holy Spirit is the annihilation of the proper individuality of the person who is the instrument of it, and the elevation of his personal feelings to the height of the divine word. This is precisely the character of Elizabeth's salutation ; we shall find it the same in the song of Zacharias. Thus the truth of this word, "Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost," is justified by this very fact. The reading of some Alexandrians, *ἀνεβόησεν*, would indicate a cry, instead of a simple breaking forth into speech. The reading *κραυγῇ* of three other Alex. would have the same meaning. They both savor of exaggeration. In any case both could not be admitted together. We may translate, "Blessed art thou," or "Blessed be thou." The former translation is best ; for exclamation is more in place here than a wish. The superlative form, *blessed among*, is not unknown to classical Greek. The expression, "the fruit of thy womb," appears to imply the fact of the incarnation was already accomplished ; so also does the expression, "the mother of my Lord" (ver. 43). Ἵνα, *in order that* (ver. 43), may keep its ordinary meaning : "What have I done *in order that* this blessing might come to me?" This *ἵνα* is used from the standpoint of the divine intention. From Mary and her Son, her thought glances to herself and her own child. In calling Mary "the mother of my Lord," she declares herself the servant of the Messiah, and consequently of His mother also. Everything of a sublime character springs from a deeper source than the understanding. The leaping of John, a prelude of the work of his life, belongs to the unfathomable depths of instinctive life. Elizabeth sees in it a sign of the truth of the presentiment she felt as soon as she saw Mary.

At ver. 45 she reverts to Mary. The expression *blessed* is doubtless inspired by the contemplation of the calm happiness that irradiates the figure of the young mother. Ὅτι cannot be taken here in the sense of *because ;* for the word *πιστεύσασα*, *she that believed*, in order that it may have its full force, must not govern anything. "Blessed is she that, at the critical moment, could exercise faith (the aorist)!" De Wette, Bleek, Meyer, think that the proposition which follows should depend on *πιστεύσασα* : "she *who believed* that the things . . . would have their accomplishment. The two former, because *σοί* would be necessary in place of *αὐτῇ* ; the third,

* Ver. 42 ℵ. C. F. several Mnn., read *ανεβοησεν*, instead of *ανεφωνησεν*, which is the reading of T. R. with all the rest. B. L. Z. and Origen (three times read *κραυγη* in place of *φωνη*.

because all that had been promised to Mary was already accomplished. But Elizabeth's thought loses itself in a kind of meditation, and her words, ceasing to be an apostrophe to Mary, become a hymn of faith. This accounts for the use of a pronoun of the third person. As to Meyer, he forgets that the accomplishment is only just begun, and is far from being completed. The glorification of the Messiah and of Israel still remains to be accomplished. Τελείωσις denotes this *complete* accomplishment. But how could Elizabeth speak of the kind of things which had been promised to Mary? What had passed between the angel and Zacharias had enlightened her respecting the similar things that must have taken place between Heaven and Mary.

3. The song of Mary: vers. 46–56. Elizabeth's salutation was full of excitement (she spake out with a loud voice), but Mary's hymn breathes a sentiment of deep inward repose. The greater happiness is, the calmer it is. So Luke says simply, *εἶπε, she said.* A majesty truly regal reigns throughout this canticle. Mary describes first her actual impressions (vers. 46–48*a*); thence she rises to the divine fact which is the cause of them (vers. 48*b*–50); she next contemplates the development of the historical consequences contained in it (vers. 51–53); lastly, she celebrates the moral necessity of this fact as the accomplishment of God's ancient promises to His people (vers. 54 and 55). The tone of the first strophe has a sweet and calm solemnity. It becomes more animated in the second, in which Mary contemplates the work of the Most High. It attains its full height and energy in the third, as Mary contemplates the immense revolution of which this work is the beginning and cause. Her song drops down and returns to its nest in the fourth, which is, as it were, the amen of the canticle. This hymn is closely allied to that of the mother of Samuel (1 Sam. 2), and contains several sentences taken from the book of Psalms. Is it, as some have maintained, destitute of all originality on this account? By no means. There is a very marked difference between Hannah's song of triumph and Mary's. While Mary celebrates her happiness with deep humility and holy restraint, Hannah surrenders herself completely to the feeling of personal triumph; with her very first words she breaks forth into cries of indignation against her enemies. As to the borrowed biblical phrases, Mary gives to these consecrated words an entirely new meaning and a higher application. The prophets frequently deal in this way with the words of their predecessors. By this means these organs of the Spirit exhibit the continuity and progress of the divine work. Criticism asks whether Mary turned over the leaves of her Bible before she spoke. It forgets that every young Israelite knew by heart from childhood the songs of Hannah, Deborah, and David; that they sang them as they went up to the feasts at Jerusalem; and that the singing of psalms was the daily accompaniment of the morning and evening sacrifice, as well as one of the essential observances of the passover meal.

Vers. 46–55.* "And Mary said, My soul doth magnify the Lord. 47. And my

* Ver. 46. Three MSS. of the Italic, a. b. l., read Elizabeth instead of Mary. Irenæus, at least in the Latin translation, follows this reading; and Origen (Latin translation) speaks of MSS. in which it was found. Ver. 49. ℵ. B. D. L. read *μεγαλα* instead of *μεγαλεια*, the reading of T. R. with 22 Mjj. and all the Mnn. Ver. 50. B. C. L. Z. read *εις γενεας και γενεας*; ℵ. F. M. O. and several Mnn., *εις γενεας και γενεαν*, in place of *εις γενεας γενεων*, which is the reading of 12 Mjj and most of the Mnn. Ver. 51. ℵ^{ca} E. F. H. O^{a}. O^{c}. and some Mnn. read *διανοιας* instead of *διανοια*. Ver. 55. C. F. M. O. S. 60 Mnn. read *εως αιωνος* instead of *εις τον αιωνα*. Ver. 56. ℵ. B L. Z. read *ως* instead of *ωσει*. D. It^{plerique}, Or., omit it.

spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. 48*a*. For he hath regarded the low estate of his handmaiden.

"48*b*. For, behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. 49. For he that is mighty hath done to me great things; and holy is his name. 50. And his mercy is on them that fear him from generation to generation.

"51. He hath showed strength with his arm; he hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts. 52. He hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree. 53. He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich he hath sent empty away.

"54. He hath holpen his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy; 53. (As he spake to our fathers), to Abraham, and to his seed for ever."

Vers. 46–48*a*. The contrast between the tone of this canticle and Elizabeth's discourse forbids the admission of the reading of some Latin authorities which puts it in the mouth of the latter. It is, indeed, Mary's reply to the congratulations of Elizabeth. Luke does not say that Mary was filled with the Spirit (comp. ver. 41). At this epoch of her life she dwelt habitually in a divine atmosphere, while the inspiration of Elizabeth was only momentary. Her first word, μεγαλύνει, *magnifies*, fully expresses this state of her soul. In what, indeed, does the magnifying of the Divine Being, consist, if not in giving Him, by constant adoration (the verb is in the present tense), a larger place in one's own heart and in the hearts of men? The present, *magnifies*, is in contrast with the aorist, *rejoiced*, in the following sentence. Some would give the aorist here the sense which this tense sometimes has in Greek, that of a repetition of the act. It is more natural, however, to regard it as an allusion to a particular fact, which kindled in her a joy that was altogether peculiar. The seat of this emotion was her spirit—πνεῦμα, *spirit*. When the human spirit is referred to in Scripture, the word indicates the deepest part of our humanity, the point of contact between man and God. The soul is the actual centre of human life, the principle of individuality, and the seat of those impressions which are of an essentially personal character. This soul communicates, through the two organs with which it is endowed, the spirit and the body, with two worlds—the one above, the other below it—with the divine world and the world of nature. Thus, while the expression, "My soul doth magnify," refers to the personal emotions of Mary, to her feelings as a woman and a mother, all which find an outlet in adoration, these words, "My spirit hath rejoiced," appear to indicate the moment when, in the profoundest depths of her being, by the touch of the Divine Spirit, the promise of the angel was accomplished in her. These two sentences contain yet a third contrast: The Lord whom she magnifies is the Master of the service to which she is absolutely devoted; the Saviour in whom she has rejoiced is that merciful God who has made her feel His restoring power, and who in her person has just saved fallen humanity. Further, it is this divine compassion which she celebrates in the following words, ver. 48. What did He find in her which supplied sufficient grounds for such a favor? One thing alone—her low estate. Ταπείνωσις does not denote, as ταπεινότης does, the moral disposition of humility; Mary does not boast of her humility. It is rather, as the form of the word indicates, an act of which she had been the object, the humbling influence under which she had been brought by her social position, and by the whole circumstances which had reduced her, a daughter of kings, to the rank of the poorest of the daughters of Israel. Perhaps the interval between the moment of the incarnation, denoted by the aorists *hath rejoiced, hath regarded*, and that in which she thus cele-

brated it, was not very great. Was not that thrilling moment, when she entered the house of Zacharias, and beheld at a glance in the person of Elizabeth the fulfilment of the sign given her by the angel, the moment of supreme divine manifestation toward herself? The expression, *Behold, henceforth*, which commences the following strophe, thus becomes full of meaning.

Vers. 48*b*–50. The greatness of her happiness appears in the renown which it will bring her; hence the *γάρ, for*. The word *behold* refers to the unexpected character of this dealing. Mary ascribes to God, as its author, the fact which she celebrates, and glorifies the three divine perfections displayed in it. And first the power. In calling God the Almighty, she appears to make direct allusion to the expression of the angel: *the power of the Highest* (ver. 35). Here is an act in which is displayed, as in no other since the appearance of man, the creative power of God. The received reading *μεγαλεῖα* answers better than the reading of some Alex., *μεγάλα*, to the emphatic term נִפְלָאוֹת, which Luke doubtless read in his Hebrew document (comp. Acts 2 : 11). But this omnipotence is not of a purely physical character; it is subservient to holiness. This is the second perfection which Mary celebrates. She felt herself, in this marvellous work, in immediate contact with supreme holiness; and she well knew that this perfection more than any other constitutes the essence of God: His name is holy. The name is the sign of an object in the mind which knows it. The *name of God* therefore denotes, not the Divine Being, but the more or less adequate reflection of Him in those intelligences which are in communion with Him. Hence we see how this name can be sanctified, rendered holy. The essential nature of God may be more clearly understood by His creatures, and more completely disengaged from those clouds which have hitherto obscured it in their minds. Thus Mary had received, in the experience she had just passed through, a new revelation of the holiness of the Divine Being. This short sentence is not dependent on the *ὅτι, because*, which governs the preceding. For the *καί, and*, which follows, establishes a close connection between it and ver. 50, which, if subordinated to ver. 49, would be too drawn out. This feature of holiness which Mary so forcibly expresses, is, in fact, that which distinguishes the incarnation from all the analogous facts of heathen mythologies.

The third divine perfection celebrated by Mary is mercy (ver. 50). Mary has already sung its praise in ver. 48 in relation to herself. She speaks of it here in a more general way. By *them that fear God*, she intends more especially Zacharias and Elizabeth, there present before her; then all the members of her people who share with them this fundamental trait of Jewish piety, and who thus constitute the true Israel. The received reading *εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν, from generation to generation*, is a form of the superlative which is found in the expression *to the age of the ages*, the meaning of which is "to the most remote generations." The two other readings mentioned in the critical notes express continuity rather than remoteness in time. These words, "on them that fear him," are the transition to the third strophe. For they implicitly contain the antithesis which comes out in the verses following.

Vers. 51–53. A much more strongly marked poetical parallelism characterizes this strophe. Mary here describes with a thrill of emotion, of which even her language partakes, the great Messianic revolution, the commencement of which she was beholding at that very time. In the choice God had made of two persons of such humble condition in life as herself and her cousin, she saw at a glance the great principle which would regulate the impending renewal of all things. It is to be a complete

reversal of the human notions of greatness and meanness. The poor and the hungry are evidently the Israelites *fearing God* of ver. 50. Such expressions cannot apply to Israel as a whole—to the proud Pharisees and rich Sadducees, for example. The line of demarcation which she draws in these words passes, therefore, not between the Jews and Gentiles, but between the pious Israelites and all that exalt themselves against God, whether in or beyond Israel. The proud, the mighty, and the rich denote Herod and his court, the Pharisees and the Sadducees, as well as the foreign oppressors, Cæsar and his armies, and all the powers of heathendom. The aorists of these three verses indicate, according to Bleek, the repetition of the act; so he translates them by the present. I rather think that to Mary's eyes the catastrophe presents itself as already consummated in the act which God had just accomplished. Does not this act contain the principle of the rejection of all that is exalted in the world, and of the choice of whatever in human estimation is brought low? All these divine acts which are about to follow, one after another, will only be a further application of the same principle. They are virtually contained in that which Mary celebrates. Consequently the aorists are properly translated by the past. The first proposition of ver. 51 applies to the righteous and wicked alike. Still the former of these two applications predominates (ver. 50). The arm is the symbol of force. The expression *ποιεῖν κράτος*, *to make strength*, is a Hebraism, עשׂה חיל (Ps. 118 · 15). The LXX. translate it by *ποιεῖν δύναμιν*. If it was Luke who translated the Hebrew document into Greek, it is evident that he kept his version independent of the LXX. The favor God shows to the righteous has its necessary counterpart in the overthrow of the wicked. This is the connection of the second proposition. The expression *ὑπερηφάνους διανοίᾳ* *proud in thought*, answers to אבירי לב (Ps 76 · 6); the LXX. translate this expression by *ἀσύνετοι τῇ καρδίᾳ*. The dative *διανοίᾳ* defines the adjective: "the proud in thought, who exalt themselves in their thoughts." Mary represents all these as forming an opposing host to men that fear God; hence the expression *scatter*. With the reading *διανοίας*, *ὑπερηφάνους* is the epithet of the substantive, *proud thoughts*. This reading is evidently a mistake.

Ver. 52. From the moral contrast between the proud and the faithful, Mary passes to a contrast of their social position, the mighty and those of low degree. The former are those who reign without that spirit of humility which is inspired by the fear of Jehovah. The third antithesis (ver. 53), which is connected with the preceding, is that of suffering and prosperity. The hungry represent the class which toils for a living—artisans, like Joseph and Mary; the rich are men gorged with wealth, Israelites or heathen, who, in the use they make of God's gifts, entirely forget their dependence and responsibility. The abundance which is to compensate the former certainly consists—the contrast requires it—of temporal enjoyments. But since this abundance is an effect of the divine blessing, it implies, as its condition, the possession of spiritual graces. For, from the Old Testament point of view, prosperity is only a snare, when it does not rest on the foundation of peace with God. And so also, the spoliation which is to befall the rich is without doubt the loss of their temporal advantages. But what makes this loss a real evil is, that it is the effect of a divine curse upon their pride.

The poetic beauty of these three verses is heightened by a crossing of the members of the three antitheses, which is substituted for the ordinary method of symmetrical parallelism. In the first contrast (ver. 51), the righteous occupy the first place, the proud the second; in the second, on the contrary (ver. 52), the mighty occupy the

first place, so as to be in close connection with the proud of ver. 51, and the lowly the second; in the third (ver. 53), the hungry come first, joining themselves with the lowly of ver. 52, and the rich form the second member. The mind passes in this way, as it were, on the crest of a wave, from like to like, and the taste is not offended, as it would have been by a symmetrical arrangement in which the homogeneous members of the contrast occurred every time in the same order.

Vers. 54, 55. Mary celebrates in this last strophe the faithfulness of God. That, in fact, is the foundation of the whole Messianic work. If the preceding strophe unveils to us the future developments of this work, this sends us back to its beginning in the remote past. Παῖς signifies here *servant* rather than *son*. It is an allusion to the title of Israel, *servant of the Lord* (Isa. 41 : 8). The Master sees His well-beloved servant crushed beneath the burden which his pitiless oppressors have imposed, and he takes it upon himself (middle λαμβανεσθαι) in order to comfort him (ἀντί). This term, *Israel, his servant*, seems at first sight to apply to the whole people; and doubtless it is this explanation that has led several interpreters to apply the expressions, *proud, mighty, rich*, in the preceding verses, solely to foreign oppressors. If, as we have seen, the latter explanation cannot be maintained, we must conclude that by this Israel, the servant of God, Mary understands the God-fearing Israelites of the fiftieth verse, not as individuals, but as the true representatives of the nation itself. The faithful portion of the nation is identified in this expression with the nation as a whole, because it is its true substance; besides, Mary could not know beforehand how far this true Israel would correspond with the actual people. For her own part, she already sees in hope (aorist ἀντελάβετο) the normal Israel transformed into the glorified Messianic nation. Would such a view as this have been possible when once the national unbelief had apparently foiled all these Messianic hopes? There is nothing here to hinder the infinitive of the end, μνησθῆναι, from preserving its proper meaning. *To remember his promises* signifies, in order not to be unfaithful. Erasmus, Calvin, and others regard the datives τῷ Ἀβραάμ and τῷ σπέρματι as governed by ἐλάλησε, in apposition with πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας: "As he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed . . ." But this construction is forced and inadmissible. Besides, the last words, *for ever*, if referred to the verb *He spake*, would have no meaning. Therefore we must make the proposition, *as he spake to our fathers*, a parenthesis intended to recall the divine faithfulness, and refer the datives, *to Abraham and to his seed*, to the verb, *to remember his mercy*. It is the dative of favor, *to remember toward Abraham and . . .* For Abraham, as well as his race, enjoys the mercy which is shown to the latter (comp. ver. 17). The words *for ever* qualify the idea, not to forget his mercy. Divine forgetfulness will never cause the favor promised to Israel to cease. Would any poet have ever put such words into the mouth of Mary, when Jerusalem was in ruins and its people dispersed?

Ver. 56. is a historical conclusion. Did the departure of Mary take place before the birth of John the Baptist? We might suppose so from the particle δέ and the aorist ἐπλήσθη (ver. 57), which very naturally imply a historical succession. But, on the other hand, it would be hardly natural that Mary should leave at a time when the expected deliverance of Elizabeth was so near at hand. This verse, therefore, must be regarded as a historical anticipation, such as is frequently found in Luke. Comp. 1 : 65, 3 : 19, 20, etc.

FOURTH NARRATIVE.—CHAP. 1 : 57–80.

Birth and Circumcision of John the Baptist.

Here opens the second cycle of the narratives of the infancy. This first narration comprises—1. The birth of John (vers. 57, 58); 2. The circumcision of the child (vers. 59–66); 3. The song of Zacharias, with a short historical conclusion (vers. 67–80).

1. Birth of John : vers. 57 and 58. These verses are like a pleasing picture of Jewish home life. We see the neighbors and relations arriving one after the other—the former first, because they live nearest. Elizabeth, the happy mother, is the central figure of the scene ; every one comes up to her in turn. Ἐμεγάλυνε μετ' αὐτῆς, literally, *he had magnified with her*, is a Hebraistic expression (הִגְדִּיל עִם ; comp. 1 Sam. 12 : 24 in the LXX.). This use of μετά, *with*, comes from the fact that man is in such cases the material which concurs in the result of the divine action.

2. Circumcision of John : vers. 59–66.* As an Israelitish child by its birth became a member of the human family, so by circumcision, on the corresponding day of the following week, he was incorporated into the covenant (Gen. 17) ; and it was the custom on this occasion to give him his name. The subject of ἦλθον, *came*, is that of the preceding verse. It has been maintained that the text suggests something miraculous in the agreement of Elizabeth and Zacharias ; as if, during the nine months which had just passed away, the father had not made to the mother a hundred times over the communication which he presently makes to all present (ver. 63)! How many times already, especially during Mary's stay in their house, must the names of John and Jesus have been mentioned! It has been inferred from the words, *they made signs to him* (ver. 62), that Zacharias became deaf as well as dumb. But the case of Zacharias cannot be assimilated to that of deaf mutes from their birth, in whom dumbness ordinarily results from deafness. The whole scene, on the contrary, implies that Zacharias had heard everything. The use of the language of signs proceeds simply from this, that we instinctively adopt this means of communication toward those who can speak in no other way.

Ver. 63. The word λέγων added to ἐγραψεν is a Hebraism (לֵאמֹר כָּתַב, 2 Kings 10 . 6), the meaning of which is, "deciding the question." The expression, *his name is*, points to a higher authority which has so determined it ; and it is this circumstance, rather than the agreement between the father and mother—a fact so easily explained—which astonishes the persons present. Every one recalls on this occasion the strange events which had preceded the birth of the child.

Ver. 64. Zacharias, thus obedient, recovers his speech, of which his want of faith had deprived him. The verb ἀνεῴχθη, *was opened*, does not agree with the second subject, the tongue, for which the verb *was loosed*, taken from the preceding verb, must be supplied. In the words, *he spake and praised God*, naturally it is on the word *spake* that the emphasis rests, in opposition to his previous dumbness. The last words are only an appendix serving to introduce the song which follows. We must therefore refrain from translating, with Ostervald, "He spake by praising God."

* Ver. 61. ℵ. A. B. C. L. Δ. Λ. Z. Π. and some Mnn. read ἐκ τῆς συγγενειας, in place of ἐν τῇ συγγενειᾳ, the reading of T. R., with 11 Mjj., the greater part of the Mnn. Syr. It. Ver. 62. ℵ. B. D. F. G., αὐτο in place of αὐτω. Ver. 65. ℵ* reads διὰ τα instead of διελ κλειτο παντα τα. Ver. 66. ℵ. B. C. D. L. It. Vg. add γαρ after και.

Ver. 65. At the sight of this miracle, surprise changes into fear. And this impression spreads abroad, with the report of these facts, throughout all the country. That is more especially the sense of the reading of ℵ, which, however, from a critical point of view, it is impossible to adopt. Ver. 66. They not merely told, they laid to heart; these were the first emotions of the Messianic era. The Alex. reading, καὶ γάρ, *for also the hand of the Lord was with him*, although adopted by Tischendorf, appears to us untenable. Whether, in fact, this *for* be put in the mouth of the narrator, or be assigned to the persons who ask the preceding question, in either case these words, *the hand of the Lord was with him*, must refer to all the circumstances which have just been narrated, while, according to the natural sense of the imperfect ἦν, *was*, they apply to the entire childhood of John the Baptist. This *for* has been wrongly added, with a view of making this reflection the motive of the preceding question. The T. R. is supported by not only the majority of the Mjj., but more especially by the agreement of the Alexandrinus and of the Peschito, which is always a criterion worthy of attention. The development of this child was effected with the marked concurrence of divine power. The *hand*, here as usually, is the emblem of force. These last words form the first of those resting-points which we shall often meet with in the course of our Gospel, and which occur in the book of the Acts. It is a picture, drawn with a single stroke of the pen, of the entire childhood of John the Baptist. Comp. ver. 80, which describes, by a corresponding formula, his youth.

3. The song of Zacharias: vers. 67–80. It might be supposed that Zacharias composed this song in view of the religious and moral progress of the child, or on the occasion of some special event in which the divine power within him was displayed during the course of his childhood. We are led, however, to another supposition by the connection between the first words of the song, *Blessed be the Lord* and the expression which the evangelist has employed in ver. 64, "he spake, blessing God." This song, which was composed in the priest's mind during the time of his silence, broke solemnly from his lips the moment speech was restored to him, as the metal flows from the crucible in which it has been melted the moment that an outlet is made for it. At ver. 64 Luke is contented to indicate the place of the song, in order not to interrupt the narrative, and he has appended the song itself to his narrative, as possessing a value independent of the time when it was uttered. We observe in the hymn of Zacharias the same order as in the salutation of Elizabeth. The theocratic sentiment breaks forth first: Zacharias gives thanks for the arrival of the times of the Messiah (vers. 68–75). Then his paternal feeling comes out, as it were, in a parenthesis: the father expresses his joy at the glorious part assigned to his son in this great work (vers. 76 and 77); lastly, thanksgiving for the Messianic salvation overflows and closes the song (vers. 78 and 79). The spiritual character of this passage appears even from this exposition. It is the work of the Holy Spirit alone to subordinate even the legitimate emotions of paternal affection to the theocratic sentiment.

1st. Vers. 67–75. Zacharias gives thanks first of all for the coming of the Messiah (vers. 67–70); then for the deliverance which His presence is about to procure for Israel (vers. 71–75).

Vers. 67–75.* "And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost, and

* Ver. 70, ℵ. B. L. W^c. Δ. some Mnn. Or. omit τῶν after ἁγίων. Ver. 74. ℵ. B. L. W^c. some Mnn. Or. omit ἡμῶν. Ver. 75. B. L., ταῖς ἡμέραις, instead of τὰς ἡμέρας. ℵ. A. B. C. D. and 11 other Mjj. 40 Mnn. Syr. It. omit τῆς ζωῆς, which is the reading of T. R. with 7 Mjj. Or.

prophesied, saying, 68. Blessed be the Lord God of Israel ; for He hath visited and redeemed His people, 69. And hath raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of His servant David. 70. As He spake by the mouth of His holy prophets, which have been since the world began ; 71. That we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us ; 72. To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember His holy covenant, 73. The oath which He sware to our father Abraham, 74. That He would grant unto us, that we, being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might serve Him without fear. 75. In holiness and righteousness before Him, all the days of our life."

The aorists, *hath raised up, hath delivered*, imply a knowledge on Zacharias' part of the fact of the incarnation. The term *visited* refers to the absence of God during the four centuries in which the prophetic voice had been silent and heaven shut. The abstract expressions of the sixty-eighth verse are followed in ver. 69 by one more concrete. Zacharias is emboldened to designate the Messiah Himself. He calls Him a horn of salvation. This image of a horn is frequent in the Old Testament, where it had been already applied to the Messiah : I will raise up a horn to David (Ps. 132 : 16). The explanation must be found neither in the horns of the altar on which criminals sought to lay hold, nor in the horns with which they ornamented their helmets ; the figure is taken from the horns of the bull, in which the power of this animal resides. It is a natural image among an agricultural people. The term ἤγειρε, *hath raised up*, is properly applied to an organic growth, like a horn. Just as the strength of the animal is concentrated in its horn, so all the delivering power granted to the family of David for the advantage of the people will be concentrated in the Messiah. This verse implies that Zacharias regarded Mary as a descendant of David. In ver. 70, Zacharias sets forth the greatness of this appearing by referring to the numerous and ancient promises of which it is the subject. Whether with or without the article τῶν, ἁγίων (*holy*) must in any case be taken as an adjective ; and it is unnecessary to translate, *of His saints of every age who have been prophets*, which would imply that all the saints have prophesied. If τῶν is retained, the word simply serves as a point of support to the definitive term ἀπ' αἰῶνος. The epithet *holy* characterizes the prophets as organs, not of a human and consequently profane word, but of a divine revelation. Holiness is the distinctive feature of all that emanates from God. We may judge, by the impression which the certain approach of Christ's advent would make on us, of the feeling which must have been produced in the hearts of these people by the thought, The Messiah is there ; history, long suspended, resumes its march, and touches its goal.

In vers. 71–75, Zacharias describes the work of this Messiah. The most natural explanation of σωτηρίαν, *salvation*, is to regard this word as in apposition with the term *horn of salvation* (ver. 69). The notion of salvation is easily substituted for that of a Saviour. The idea of salvation, brought out in this first word, is exhibited in its full meaning in ver. 74. The two terms, *our enemies, and them that hate us*, cannot be altogether synonymous. The former denotes the foreign heathen oppressors ; the latter would embrace also the native tyrants, Herod and his party, so odious to true Israelites. In granting this deliverance, God shows mercy (ver. 72), not only to the living, but to the dead, who were waiting with the heartsickness of deferred hope for the accomplishment of the promises, and especially of the oaths of God. On this idea, see 1 : 17 ; for the infinitive μνησθῆναι, ver. 54 ; for the turn of expression ποιεῖν μετά, ver. 58. Ὅρκον (ver. 73) is in apposition with διαθήκης. The accusative is occa-

sioned by the pronoun *ὄν*. This attraction is the more easily accounted for, that *μνᾶσθαι* is construed in the LXX. with the accusative and the genitive indifferently. The infinitive *to grant* expresses the long-expected end of the development of prophecy, a development which seems designed to typify this long period. The article *τοῦ* characterizes the infinitive *δοῦναι* as the end desired and determined from the beginning. Grammatically, it depends on *ὅρκον*; logically, on all that precedes. In the following phrase, the relation of *ῥυσθέντας* to *λατρεύειν* should be observed: *after having been delivered, to serve God:* the end is perfect religious service; political deliverance is only a means to it. Perfect worship requires outward security. The Messiah is about to reign; no Antiochus Epiphanes or Pompey shall any more profane the sanctuary! We find here in all its purity the ideal salvation as it is described in the Old Testament, and as the son of Zacharias himself understood it to the very last. Its leading feature is the indissoluble union of the two deliverances, the religious and the political; it was a glorious theocracy founded on national holiness. This programme prevented John the Baptist from identifying himself with the course of the ministry of Jesus. How, after the unbelief of Israel had created a gulf between the expectation and the facts, could a later writer, attributing to Zacharias just what words he pleased, put into his mouth these fond hopes of earlier days?

Ὁσιότης, *purity*, and *δικαιοσύνη*, *righteousness* (ver. 75), have been distinguished in several ways. Bleek and others refer the former of these terms to the inward disposition, the latter to the outward conduct. But righteousness, in the Scriptures, comprehends more than the outward act. Others apply the former to relations with God, the latter to relations with men. But righteousness also comprehends man's relations with God. It appears to us rather that purity, *ὁσιότης*, is a negative quality, the absence of stain; and righteousness *δικαιοσύνη*, a positive quality, the presence of all those religious and moral virtues which render worship acceptable to God. Comp. Eph. 4 : 24. The authorities decide in favor of the excision of the words *τῆς ζωῆς*, although the French translation cannot dispense with them. At the time of the captivity, the prophet-priest Ezekiel contemplated, under the image of a temple of perfect dimensions, the perfected theocracy (Ezek. 40 : 48). Here the priest-prophet Zacharias contemplates the same ideal under the image of an uninterrupted and undefiled worship. The Holy Spirit adapts the form of His revelations to the habitual prepossessions of those who are to be the organs of them.

2d. Vers. 76, 77. From the height to which he has just attained, Zacharias allows his glance to fall upon the little child at rest before him, and he assigns him his part in the work which has begun. Ver. 76 refers to him personally, ver. 77 to his mission.

Vers. 76 and 77.* "And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest, for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare His ways, 77. To give knowledge of salvation unto His people by the remission of their sins."

The reading *καὶ σύ*, *and thou*, connects, by an easy transition, the forerunner with the work of the Messiah. The Alex. reading, *καὶ σὺ δέ*, *but thou*, brings out more strongly, too strongly, doubtless, this secondary personality; it has against it not only the sixteen other Mjj., but further, the *Peschito*, the *Italic*, Irenæus, and

* Ver. 76. ℵ. B. C. D. L. R. read *δε* after *και συ*. ℵ. B. Or., *ενωπιον* instead of *προ προσωπου*. Ver. 77. A. C. M. O. R. U., some Mnn., read *ημων* instead of *αυτων*.

Origen, and must therefore be rejected. The title of prophet of the Highest simply places John the Baptist in that choir of the prophets of whom Zacharias speaks in ver. 70; later on, Jesus will assign him a higher place. In saying the Lord, Zacharias can only be thinking of the Messiah. This is proved by the *πρό, before Him,* in *προπορεύσῃ,* and the *αὐτοῦ, His ways.* But he could not designate Him by this name, unless, with Malachi, he recognized in His coming the appearing of Jehovah (comp. 1:17, 43, 2:11). The second proposition is a combination of the two propositions, Isa. 40:3 (*ἑτοιμάσαι*) and Mal. 3:1 (*προπορεύσῃ*), prophecies which are also found combined in Mark 1:2, 3. The article *τοῦ* before *δοῦναι, to give,* indicates a *purpose.* This word, in fact, throws a vivid light on the aim of John the Baptist's ministry. Why was the ministry of the Messiah preceded by that of another divine messenger? Because the very notion of salvation was falsified in Israel, and had to be corrected before salvation could be realized. A carnal and malignant patriotism had taken possession of the people and their rulers, and the idea of a political deliverance had been substituted for that of a moral salvation. If the notion of salvation had not been restored to its scriptural purity before being realized by the Messiah, not only would He have had to employ a large part of the time assigned to Him in accomplishing this indispensable task; but further, He would certainly have been accused of inventing a theory of salvation to suit His impotence to effect any other. There was needed, then, another person, divinely authorized, to remind the people that perdition consisted not in subjection to the Romans, but in divine condemnation; and that salvation, therefore, was not temporal emancipation, but the forgiveness of sins. To implant once more in the hearts of the people this notion of salvation was indeed to prepare the way for Jesus, who was to accomplish this salvation, and no other. The last words, *by the remission of their sins,* depend directly on the word *σωτηρίας, salvation:* salvation by, that is to say, consisting in. The article *τῆς* is omitted before *ἐν ἀφέσει,* as is the case when the definitive forms, with the word on which it depends, merely one and the same notion. The pronoun *αὐτῶν* refers to all the individuals comprehended under the collective idea of people. The authorities which read *ἡμῶν* are insufficient. The words *to His people* show that Israel although the people of God, were blind to the way of salvation. John the Baptist was to show to this people, who believed that all they needed was political restoration, that they were not less guilty than the heathen, and that they needed just as much divine pardon. This was precisely the meaning of the baptism to which he invited the Jews.

3d. Vers. 78 and 79. After this episode, Zacharias returns to the principal subject of his song, and, in an admirable closing picture, describes the glory of Messiah's appearing, and of the salvation which He brings.

Vers. 78 and 79.* "Through the tender mercy of our God, whereby the dayspring from on high hath visited us, 79. To give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet unto the way of peace."

Zacharias ascends to the highest source whence this stream of grace pours down upon our earth—the divine mercy. This idea is naturally connected with that of pardon (ver. 77), as is expressed by *διά* with the accusative, which means properly *by reason of.* The bowels in Scripture are the seat of all the sympathetic emotions. Σπλάγχνα answers to רחמים. The future *ἐπισκέψεται, will visit,* in some Alex., is evidently a correction suggested by the consideration that Christ was not born at the

* Ver. 78. ℵ. B. L., *επισκεψεται.* instead of *επεσκεψατο.*

time Zacharias was speaking. Yet even such instances as these do not disturb the faith of critics in the authority of Alexandrine MSS. !

All the images in the picture portrayed in vers. 78, 79 appear to be borrowed from the following comparison : A caravan misses its way and is lost in the desert ; the unfortunate pilgrims, overtaken by night, are sitting down in the midst of this fearful darkness, expecting death. All at once a bright star rises in the horizon and lights up the plain ; the travellers, taking courage at this sight, arise, and by the light of this star find the road which leads them to the end of their journey. The substantive *ἀνατολή, the rising*, which by general consent is here translated the dawn, has two senses in the LXX. It is employed to translate the noun צמח, *branch*, by which Jeremiah and Zechariah designate the Messiah. This sense of the word *ἀνατολή* is unknown in profane Greek. The term is also used by the LXX. to express the rising of a heavenly body—the rising of the moon, for instance ; comp. Isa. 60 : 19. This sense agrees with the meaning of the verb *ἀνατέλλειν* ; Isa. 60 : 1, "The glory of the Lord hath risen (*ἀνατέταλκεν*) upon thee ;" Mal. 4 : 2, "The sun of righteousness shall rise (*ἀνατελεῖ*) upon you." This is the meaning of the word *ἀνατολή* in good Greek. And it appears to us that this is its meaning here. It follows, indeed, from the use of the verb *hath visited us*, which may very well be said of a star, but not of a branch ; and the same remark applies to the images that follow, *to light* and *to direct* (ver. 79). Besides, the epithet *from on high* agrees much better with the figure of a star than with that of a plant that sprouts. The regimen *from on high* does not certainly quite agree with the verb *to rise*. But the term *from on high* is suggested by the idea of visiting, which goes before : it is from the bosom of divine mercy that this star comes down, and it does not rise upon humanity until after it has descended and been made man. Bleek does not altogether reject this obvious meaning of *ἀνατολή* ; but he maintains that we should combine it with the sense of branch, by supposing a play of words turning upon the double image of a sprouting branch and a rising star ; and as there is no Hebrew word which will bear this double meaning, he draws from this passage the serious critical consequence, that this song, and therefore all the others contained in these two chapters, were originally written, not in Aramean, but in Greek, which of course deprives them of their authenticity. But this whole explanation is simply a play of Bleek's imagination. There is nothing in the text to indicate that the author intends any play upon words here ; and, as we have seen, none of the images employed are compatible with the meaning of branch.

The expressions of ver. 79 are borrowed from Isa. 9 : 1, 60 : 2. Darkness is the emblem of alienation from God, and of the spiritual ignorance that accompanies it. This darkness is a shadow of death, because it leads to perdition, just as the darkening of sight in the dying is a prelude to the night of death. The term *sit* denotes a state of exhaustion and despair. The sudden shining forth of the star brings the whole caravan of travellers to their feet (*τοὺς πόδας*), and enables them to find their way. The *way of peace* denotes the means of obtaining reconciliation with God, the chief of all temporal and spiritual blessings. Εἰρήνη, *peace*, answers to שלום, a word by which the Hebrew language designates the bountiful supply of whatever answers to human need—full prosperity.

Ver. 80. The historical conclusion, ver. 80, corresponds with that in ver. 66. As the latter sketches with a stroke of the pen the childhood of John, so this gives a picture of his youth, and carries us forward to the time when he began his ministry. The term *he grew* refers to his physical development, and the expression following,

waxed strong in spirit, to his spiritual development, that is to say, religious, moral, and intellectual. The predominant feature of this development was force, energy (he grew strong in spirit.) Luke, doubtless, means by this the power of the will over the instincts and inclinations of the body. The *spirit* is here certainly that of John himself ; but when a man develops in a right way, it is only by communion with the Divine Spirit that his spirit unfolds, as the flower only blows when in contact with the light. This spiritual development of John was due to no human influence. For the child lived in the deserts. Probably the desert of Judea is meant here, an inhabited country, whose deeply creviced soil affords an outlet to several streams that empty themselves into the Dead Sea. This country, abounding in caves, has always been the refuge of anchorites. In the time of John the Baptist there were probably Essenian monasteries there ; for history says positively that these cenobites dwelt upon both shores of the Dead Sea. It has been inferred from this passage that John, during his sojourn in the desert, visited these sages, and profited by their teaching. This opinion is altogether opposed to the design of the text, which is to attribute to God alone the direction of the development of the forerunner. But more than this. If John was taught by the Essenes, it must be admitted that the only thing their instructions did for him was to lead him to take entirely opposite views on all points. The Essenes had renounced every Messianic expectation ; the soul of John's life and ministry was the expectation of the Messiah and the preparation for His work. The Essenes made matter the seat of sin ; John, by his energetic calls to conversion, shows plainly enough that he found it in the will. The Essenes withdrew from society, and gave themselves up to mystic contemplation ; John, at the signal from on high, threw himself boldly into the midst of the people, and to the very last took a most active and courageous part in the affairs of his country. If, after all, any similarities are found between him and them, John's originality is too well established to attribute them to imitation; such similarities arise from the attempt they both made to effect a reform in degenerate Judaism. The relation of John to the Essenes is very similar to that of Luther to the mystics of the middle ages. On the part of the Essenes, as of the mystics, there is the human effort which attests the need ; on the part of John, as well as of Luther, the divine work which satisfies it. The abstract plural *in the deserts* proves that this observation is made with a moral and not a geographical aim. The word *ἀνάδειξις*, *showing*, denotes the installation of a servant into his office, his official institution into his charge. The author of this act, unnamed but understood, is evidently God. It follows from 3 : 2, and from John 1 : 31-33, that a direct communication from on high, perhaps a theophany, such as called Moses from the desert, was the signal for John to enter upon his work. But we have no *account* of this scene which took place between God and His messenger. Our evangelists only relate what they know.

FIFTH NARRATIVE.—CHAP. 2 : 1–20.

The Birth of the Saviour.

Henceforth there exists in the midst of corrupt humanity a pure Being, on whom God's regard can rest with unmingled satisfaction. Uniting in this divine contemplation, the celestial intelligences already see streaming from this fire those waves of light which will ultimately penetrate to the remotest bounds of the moral universe. The new creation, the union of God with the sanctified creature, begins to find its ac

complishment in this Being, in order to extend from Him to the whole of mankind, and to comprehend at last heaven itself, which is to be united with us under one and the same head, and to adore one Lord Jesus Christ as its Lord (Col. 1 : 20 ; Eph. 1 : 10 ; Phil. 2 : 9–11). Such is the point of view we must take in order to appreciate the following narrative : 1. Jesus is born (vers. 1–7) ; 2. The angels celebrate this birth (vers. 8–14) ; 3. The shepherds ascertain and publish it (vers. 15–20).

1. The Birth of Jesus : vers. 1–7. And first a historical note : vers. 1 and 2.* The words *in those days* refer to the time which followed the birth of John the Baptist, and give the remark in 1 : 80 an anticipatory character. Δόγμα denotes, in classical Greek, any *edict* of a recognized authority. The use of the word ἐξελθεῖν, *to go forth*, in the sense of *being published*, answers to the meaning of יצא, Dan. 9 : 2, 3. The term ἀπογραφή, *description*, denotes among the Romans the inscription on an official register of the name, age, profession, and fortune of each head of a family, and of the number of his children, with a view to the assessment of a tax. The fiscal taxation which followed was more particularly indicated by the term ἀποτίμησις. Criticism raises several objections against the truth of the fact related in ver. 1 : 1st, No historian of the time mentions such a decree of Augustus. 2d, On the supposition that Augustus had issued such an edict, it would not have been applicable to the states of Herod in general, nor to Judea in particular, since this country was not reduced to a Roman province until ten or eleven years later—the year 6 of our era. 3d, A Roman edict, executed within the states of Herod, must have been executed according to Roman forms ; and according to these, it would have been in no way necessary for Joseph to put in an appearance at Bethlehem ; for, according to Roman law, registration was made at the place of birth or residence, and not at the place where the family originated. 4th, Even admitting the necessity of removal in the case of Joseph, this obligation did not extend to Mary, who, as a woman, was not liable to registration. In order to meet some of these difficulties, Hug has limited the meaning of the words, *all the earth*, to Palestine. But the connection of this expression with the name Cæsar Augustus will not allow of our accepting this explanation ; besides which, it leaves several of the difficulties indicated untouched. The reader who feels any confidence in Luke's narrative, and who is desirous of solving its difficulties, will find, we think, a solution resulting from the following facts :

From the commencement of his reign, Augustus always aimed at a stronger centralization of the empire. Already, under Julius Cæsar, there had been undertaken, with a view to a more exact assessment of taxation, a great statistical work, a complete survey of the empire *descriptio orbis*. This work, which occupied thirty-two years, was only finished under Augustus.† This prince never ceased to labor in the same direction. After his death, Tiberius caused to be read in the Senate, in accordance with instructions contained in the will of Augustus, a statistical document, which applied not only to the empire properly so called, but also to the allied kingdoms—a category to which the states of Herod belonged. This document, called "Breviarium totius imperii," was written entirely by Augustus' own hand.‡ It gave

* Ver. 2. ℵ. B. D. omit η after αυτη. Instead of απογραφη πρωτη εγενετο, ℵ * reads απογραφη εγενετο πρωτη. Instead of Κυρηνιου, A. Κηρυνιου, B* Κυρεινου, B³. It. Vg. Κυρινου (Cyrino).

† See the recent work of Wieseler, "Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien," etc., 1869, p. 23.

‡ Tacitus Ann. i. 11 ; Suetonius, Octav. c. 27, 28, 101.

"the number of the citizens and *of allies under arms*, of the fleets, of the kingdoms, of the provinces, of *the tributes or taxes*." The compilation of such a document as this necessarily supposes a previous statistical labor, comprehending not only the empire proper, but also the allied states. And if Augustus had ordered this work, Herod, whose kingdom belonged to the number of *regna reddita*, could not have refused to take part in it. The silence of historians in regard to this fact proves simply nothing against its reality. Wieseler gives a host of examples of similar omissions. The great statistical work previously accomplished by Julius Cæsar, and about which no one can entertain a doubt, is not noticed by any historian of the time.* Josephus, in his "Jewish War," written before his "Antiquities," when giving an account of the government of Coponius, does not mention even the census of Quirinius.† Then it must not be forgotten that one of our principal sources for the life of Augustus, Dion Cassius, presents a blank for just the years 748–750 U.C. Besides, this silence is amply compensated for by the positive information we find in later writers. Thus, Tertullian mentions, as a well known fact, "the census taken in Judea under Augustus by Sentius Saturnius," ‡ that is to say, from 744–748 U.C., and consequently only a short time before the death of Herod in 750. The accounts of Cassiodorus and Suidas leave no doubt as to the great statistical labors accomplished by the orders of Augustus.§ The latter says expressly: "Cæsar Augustus, having chosen twenty men of the greatest ability, sent them into all the countries of the subject nations (*τῶν ὑπηκόων*), and caused them to make a registration (*ἀπογραφάς*) of men and property (*τῶντε ἀνθρώπων καὶ οὐσιῶν*)." These details are not furnished by Luke. And if the task of these commissioners specially referred, as Suidas says, *to the subject nations*, the omission of all mention of this measure in the historians of the time is more easily accounted for.

Surprise is expressed at an edict of Augustus having reference to the states of Herod. But Herod's independence was only relative. There is no money known to have been coined in his name; the silver coin circulating in his dominions was Roman.‖ From the time of the taking of Jerusalem by Pompey, the Jews paid the Romans a double tribute, a poll tax and a land-tax.¶ Tacitus also speak of complaints from Syria and Judea against the taxes which burdened them. Further, the Jews had quite recently, according to Josephus, been obliged to take individually an oath of obedience to the emperor ("Antiq." xvii. 2, 4). The application of a decree of Augustus to the dominions of Herod, a simple vassal of the emperor, presents, therefore, nothing improbable. Only it is evident that the emperor, in the execution of the decree, would take care to respect in form the sovereignty of the king, and to execute it altogether by his instrumentality. Besides, it was the custom of the Romans, especially in their fiscal measures, always to act by means of the local authorities, and to conform as far as possible to national usages.** Augustus would not depart from this method in regard to Herod, who was generally an object of favor. And this observation overthrows another objection, namely, that according to Roman

* Wieseler, in the work referred to, p. 51. † Ibid. p. 95.

‡ *Sed et census constat actos sub Auguste . . . in Judæa per Sentium Saturnium* (*Adv. Marc.* 19). The word *constat* appears to allude to public documents; and the detail by Sentius Saturnius proves that his source of information was independent of Luke.

§ Wieseler, p. 53. ‖ Ibid. p. 86. ¶ Ibid. p. 73 and fol.

** Comp. on this point the recent works of Huschke ("Ueber den Census der Kaiserzeit") and of Marquadt ("Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer").

custom Joseph would not have to present himself in the place where his family originated, since the census was taken at the place of residence. But Roman usage did not prevail here. In conformity with the remnant of independence which Judea still enjoyed, the census demanded by the emperor would certainly be executed according to Jewish orms. These, doubtless, were adapted to the ancient constitution of tribes and families, the basis of Israelitish organization : this mode was at once the simplest, since the greater part of the families still lived on their hereditary possessions, and the surest, inasmuch as families that had removed would be anxious to strengthen a link on which might depend questions of inheritance and other rights besides.* That which distinguished the census of Quirinius, ten years later, from all similar undertakings that had preceded it, was just this, that on this occasion the Roman authority *as such* executed it, without the intervention of the national power and Jewish customs. Then, accordingly, the people keenly felt the reality of their subjection, and broke into revolt. And history has preserved scarcely any record of similar measures which preceded this eventful census.

As to Mary, we may explain without any difficulty the reasons which induced her to accompany Joseph. If, at ver. 5, we make the words *with Mary* depend specially on the verb *in order to be enrolled*, the fact may be explained by the circumstance that, according to Roman law, women among conquered nations were subject to the capitation tax. Ulpian expressly says this (*De censibus*) : "that in Syria (this term comprehends Palestine) men are liable to the capitation from their fourteenth year, women from their twelfth to their sixtieth." Perhaps women were sometimes summoned to appear in person, in order that their age might be ascertained. Or, indeed, we may suppose that Mary was the sole representative of one of the branches of her tribe, an heiress, which obliged her to appear in person. Perhaps, also, by the inscription of her name she was anxious to establish anew, in view of her son, her descent from the family of David. But we may join the words *with Mary* to the verb *went up*. The motives which would induce Mary to accompany Joseph in this journey are obvious. If, in the whole course of the Gospel history, we never see the least reflection cast on the reputation of Mary, although only six months had elapsed between her marriage and the birth of Jesus, is not this circumstance explained by the very fact of this journey, which providentially removed Joseph and Mary from Nazareth for a sufficient length of time, just when the birth took place? Mary must have recognized the finger of God in the event which compelled Joseph to leave home, and have been anxious to accompany him.

But a much more serious difficulty than any of the preceding arises relative to ver. 2. If this verse is translated, as it usually is, "This census, which was the first, took place when Quirinius governed Syria," we must suppose, on account of what precedes, that Quirinius filled this office before the death of Herod. But history proves that Quirinius did not become governor of Syria until the year 4, and that he did not execute the enumeration which bears his name until the year 6 of our era, after the deposition of Archelaus, the son and successor of Herod, that is to say, ten years at least after the birth of Jesus. It was Varus who was governor of Syria at the death of Herod. An attempt has been made to solve this difficulty by correcting the text : Theodore de Beza by making ver. 2 an interpolation ; Michaelis by adding the words πρὸ τῆς after ἐγένετο : "This enumeration took place before that which

* Wieseler, pp. 66, 67.

Quirinius executed . . ." * These are conjectures without foundation. Again, it has been proposed to give the word πρώτη, *first*, a meaning more or less unusual. And accordingly, some translate this word as *primus* is sometimes to be taken in Latin, and as *erst* regularly in German: "This census was executed only when . . ." (*prima accedit cum, geschah erst als*). Such a Latinism is hardly admissible. And besides, if the execution had not followed the decree immediately (as the translation supposes), how could the decree have led to the removal of Joseph and the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem while Herod was still reigning?

An interpretation of the word πρώτη which is scarcely less forced, has been adopted by Tholuck, Ewald, Wieseler (who maintains and defends it at length in his last work), and Pressensé (in his "Vie de Jésus"). Relying on John 1 : 15, πρῶτός μου, 15 : 18, πρῶτον ὑμῶν, they give to πρώτη the sense of προτέρα, and explain πρώτη ἡγεμονεύοντος as if it were πρότερον ἢ ἡγεμονεύειν; which results in the following translation: "This enumeration took place before Quirinius . . ." They cite from the LXX. Jer. 29 : 2, ὕστερον ἐξελθόντος Ἰεχονίου, "after Jechonias was gone forth;" and from Plato, ὕστεροι ἀφίκοντο τῆς ἐν Μαραθῶνι μάχης γενομένης, "they arrived after the battle of Marathon had taken place." But this accumulation of two irregularities, the employment of the superlative for the comparative, and of the comparative adjective for the adverb, is not admissible in such a writer as Luke, whose style is generally perfectly lucid, especially if, with Wieseler, after having given to πρώτη the sense of a comparative, we want to keep, in addition, its superlative meaning: "This enumeration took place as a first one, and before that . . ." This certainly goes beyond all limits of what is possible, whatever the high philological authorities may say for it, upon whose support this author thinks he can rely.† Another attempt at interpretation, proposed by Ebrard, sets out from a distinction between the meaning of ἀπογράφεσθαι (ver. 1) and of ἀπογραφή (ver. 2). The former of these two interpretations may denote the registration, the second the pecuniary taxation which resulted from it (the ἀποτίμησις); and this difference of meaning would be indicated by the pronoun αὐτη, which it would be necessary to read αὐτή (*ipsa*), and not αὖτη (*ea*). "As to the taxation itself (which followed the registration), it took place only when Quirinius was . . ." But why, in this case, did not Luke employ, in the second verse, another word than ἀπογραφή, which evidently recalled the ἀπογράφεσθαι of ver. 1? Köhler ‡ acknowledged that these two words should have an identical meaning; but, with Paulus, Lange, and others, he thinks he can distinguish between the publication of the decree (ver. 1) and its execution (ver. 2), which only took place ten years afterward, and, with this meaning, put the accent on ἐγένετο: "Cæsar Augustus published a decree (ver. 1), and the registration decreed by him was executed (only) when Quirinius . . ." (ver. 2). But the difficulty is to see how this decree, if it was not immediately enforced, could induce the removal of Joseph and Mary. Köhler replies that the measure decreed began to be carried into execution; but on account of the disturbances which it excited it was soon suspended, and that it was only resumed and completely carried out (ἐγένετο) under Quirinius. This explanation is ingenious, but very artificial. And further, it does not suit the context.

* For this sense it would be better to conjecture a reading πρὸ τῆς as a substitute for πρώτη, admitting at the same time the place which the last word occupies in the text of ℵ and D.

† MM. Curtius at Leipsic and Schömann at Greifswald.

‡ "Encyclopédie de Herzog," Art. "Schatzung."

LIBRARY K. C. K. BAPTIST

Luke, after having positively denied the execution of the measure (ver. 2), would relate afterward (ver. 3 and ff.), without the least explanation, a fact which has no meaning, but on the supposition of the immediate execution of this decree!

There remain a number of attempted solutions which rely on history rather than philology. As far as the text is concerned, they may be classed with the ordinary explanation which treats the words ἡγεμονεύοντος Κυρηνίου as a genitive absolute. Several of the older expositors, as Casaubon, Sanclemente, and more recently Hug and Neander, starting with the fact that before Quirinius was governor of Syria he took a considerable part in the affairs of the East (Tac. Ann. iii. 48), supposed that he presided over the census, of which Luke here speaks, in the character of an imperial commissioner. Luke, they think, applied to this temporary jurisdiction the term ἡγεμονεύειν, which ordinarily denotes the function of a governor in the proper sense of the term. Zumpt even believed he could prove that Quirinius had been twice governor of Syria,* in the proper sense of the word, and that it was during the former of these two administrations that he presided over the census mentioned by Luke. Mommsen† also admits the fact of the double administration of Quirinius as governor of Syria. He relies particularly on a tumular inscription discovered in 1764,‡ which, if it refers to Quirinius, would seem to say that this person had been governor of Syria on two occasions (*iterum*). But does this inscription really refer to Quirinius? And has the term *iterum* all the force which is given to it? Wieseler clearly shows that these questions are not yet determined with any certainty. And supposing even that this double administration of Quirinius could be proved, the former, which is the one with which we are concerned here, could not have been, as Zumpt acknowledges, until from the end of 750 to 753 U.C. Now it is indisputable that at this time Herod had been dead some months (the spring of 750), and consequently, according to the text of Luke, Jesus was already born. One thing, however, is certain—that Quirinius, a person honored with the emperor's entire confidence, took a considerable part, throughout this entire period, in the affairs of the East, and of Syria in particular. And we do not see what objection there is, from a historical point of view, to the hypothesis of Gerlach,§ who thinks that, while Varus was the political and military governor of Syria (from 748), Quirinius administered its financial affairs, and that it was in the capacity of quæstor that he presided over the census which took place among the Jews at this time. Josephus (Antiq. xvi. 9. 1, 2, and Bell. Jud. i. 27. 2) designates these two magistrates, the præses and the quæstor, by the titles of ἡγεμόνες and τῆς Συρίας ἐπιστατοῦντες. There is nothing, then, to hinder our giving a somewhat more general meaning to the verb ἡγεμονεύειν, or supposing, we may add, that Luke attributed to Quirinius as governor a function which he accomplished as quæstor. In this case Quirinius would have already presided over a first enumeration under Herod in 749, before directing the better known census which took place in 759 U.C., and which provoked the revolt of Judas the Galilean.‖

* By the passage in Tac. iii. 48. "De Syriâ Romanorum provinciâ ab Cæsare Augusto ad Titum Vespasianum," 1854, and "Ueber den Census des Quirinius, Evang. Kirchenzeitung," 1865. No. 82.

† "Res gestæ Divi Augusti. Ex monumento Ancyrano."

‡ Published in the last place by Mommsen, "De P. S. Quirinii titulo Tiburtino," 1865.

§ "Römische Statthalter in Syrien," p. 33.

‖ This certainly is only a hypothesis; but we do not see what ground Keim has for characterizing it as untenable ("Gesch. Jesu," t. i. p. 402).

Those who are not satisfied with any of these attempts at explanation admit an error in Luke, but not all in the same sense. Meyer thinks that ἡγεμονεύειν in Luke's text must keep its ordinary meaning, but that Luke, in employing this term here, confounded the later enumeration of the year 6 with that over which this person presided ten years earlier in the capacity of imperial commissioner. Schleiermacher and Bleek admit a greater error : Luke must have confounded a simple sacerdotal census, which took place in the latter part of Herod's reign, with the famous enumeration of the year 6. Strauss and Keim go further still. In their view, the enumeration of vers. 1 and 2 is a pure invention of Luke's, either to account for the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem, as required by popular prejudice (Strauss), or to establish a significant parallel between the birth of Jesus and the complete subjection of the people (Keim, p. 399). But the text of Luke is of a too strictly historical and prosaic character to furnish the least support to Keim's opinion. That of Strauss might apply to a Gospel like Matthew, which lays great stress on the connection between the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem and Messianic prophecy ; but it in no way applies to Luke's Gospel, which does not contain the slightest allusion to the prophecy. Schleiermacher's explanation is a pure conjecture, and one which borders on absurdity. That of Meyer, which in substance is very nearly the opinion of Gerlach, would certainly be the most probable of all these opinions. Only there are two facts which hardly allow of our imputing to Luke a confusion of facts in this place. The first is, that, according to Acts 5 : 37, he was well acquainted with the later enumeration which occasioned the revolt of Judas the Galilean, and which he calls, in an absolute way, the enumeration. Luke could not be ignorant that this revolt took place on the occasion of the definitive annexation of Judea to the empire, and consequently at some distance of time after the death of Herod. Now, in our text, he places the enumeration of which he is speaking in the reign of Herod ! The second fact is the perfect knowledge Luke had, according to 23 : 6–9, of the subsequent political separation between Judea and Galilee. Now, the registration of a Galilean in Judea supposes that the unity of the Israelitish monarchy was still in existence. In the face of these two plain facts, it is not easy to admit that there was any confusion on his part.

May we be permitted, after so many opinions have been broached, to propose a new one ? We have seen that the census which was carried out by Quirinius in 759 U.C., ten years after the birth of Jesus, made a deep impression upon all the people, convincing them of their complete political servitude. This census is called the enumeration without any qualification, therefore (Acts 5 : 37) ; but it might also be designated the first enumeration, inasmuch as it was the first census executed by pagan authority ; and it would be in this somewhat technical sense that the expression ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη would here have to be taken. We should accentuate αυτη (as has been already proposed) αὐτή, which presents no critical difficulty, since the ancient MSS. have no accents, and understand the second verse thus : As to the census itself called the first, it took place under the government of Quirinius.* Luke would break off to remark that, prior to the well-known enumeration which took place under Quirinius, and which history had taken account of under the name of the first, there had really been another, generally lost sight of, which was the very one here in question ; and thus that it was not unadvisedly that he spoke of a census anterior to the first. In this

* We spell this name Quirinius (not Quirinus) in conformity with the authority of all the documents, B. alone and some MSS. of the It. excepted.

way, first, the intention of this parenthesis is clear; second, the *asyndeton* between vers. 1 and 2 is explained quite in a natural way; and third, the omission of the article ἡ between ἀπογραφή and πρώτη, which has the effect of making ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη a sort of proper name (like ἡ ἐπιστολὴ πρώτη, δευτέρα), is completely justified.

Vers. 3-7.* The terms οἶκος and πατριά, *house* and *family* (ver. 4), have not an invariable meaning in the LXX. According to the etymology and the context, the former appears to have here the wider meaning, and to denote the entire connections of David, comprising his brethren and their direct descendants. On this journey of Mary, see p. 76. The complement *with Mary* appears to us to depend, not on the verb ἀπογράψασθαι, *to be enrolled*, as Meyer, Bleek, etc., decide, but on the entire phrase ἀνέβη ἀπογράψασθαι, *he went up to be enrolled*, and more especially on *he went up*. For, as Wieseler observes, the important point for the context is, that she went up, not that she was enrolled. And the words in apposition, *being great with child*, connect themselves much better with the idea of going up than with that of being enrolled. There is great delicacy in the received reading, which has also the best support critically, his *espoused wife*. The substantive indicates the character in which Mary made the journey; the participle recalls the real state of things. The Alex., not having perceived this shade of thought, have wrongly omitted γυναικί. From the last proposition of ver. 7, in which φάτνη, *a manger*, seems opposed to κατάλυμα, *an inn*, some interpreters have inferred that the former of these two words should here have a wider sense, and signify *a stable*. But this meaning is unexampled. We have merely to supply a thought: "in the manger, because they were lodging in the stable seeing that . . ." The article τῇ designates the manger as that belonging to the stable. The Alex., therefore, have wrongly omitted it. Did this stable form part of the hostelry? or was it, as all the apocryphal writings † and Justin ‡ allege, a cave near the city? In the time of Origen,§ a grotto was shown where the birth of Jesus took place. It was on this place that Helena, the mother of Constantine, built a church; and it is probable that the Church Mariæ de Præsepio is erected on the same site. The text of Luke would not be altogether incompatible with this idea. But probably it is only a supposition, resulting on the one hand from the common custom in the East of using caves for stables, and on the other from a mistaken application to the Messiah of Isa. 33 : 16, "He shall dwell in a lofty cave," quoted by Justin. The expression *first-born* naturally implies that the writer believed Mary had other children afterward, otherwise there would be no just ground for the use of this term. It may be said that Luke employs it with a view to the account of the presentation of Jesus in the temple as a first-born son (ver. 22 *et seq.*). But this connection is out of the question in Matt. 1 : 25. This expression proves that the composition of the narrative dates from a time posterior to the birth of the brothers and sisters of Jesus. Thus was accomplished, in the obscurity of a stable, the fact which was to change the face of the world; and Mary's words (1 : 51), "He hath put down the mighty, and exalted the lowly," were still further verified. "The weakness of God is stronger than men," says St. Paul; this principle prevails throughout all this history, and constitutes its peculiar character.

* Ver. 3. ℵ^c. B. D. L. Z., ἑαυτου instead of ἰδιαν. Ver. 5. ℵ* A. D. some Mnn. ἀπογραφεσθαι in place of ἀπογραψασθαι. ℵ. B. D. L. Z. some Mnn. Syr. omit γυναικι. Ver. 7. ℵ. A. B. D. L. Z. some Mnn. omit η before φατνη.

† Protevangelium of James, History of Joseph, Gospel of the Infancy. "Works of Justin," edit. of Otto, t. i. p. 269, note.

‡ "Dial. c. Tryph." c. 78.

§ "Contra Celsum," i. 11.

2. The appearing of the angels: vers. 8–14. "The Gospel is preached to the poor." The following narrative contains the first application of this divine method. Vers. 8 and 9 relate the appearing of the angel to the shepherds; vers. 10–12, his discourse; vers. 13 and 14, the song of the heavenly host.

Vers. 8 and 9.* Among the Jews, the occupation of keepers of sheep was held in a sort of contempt. According to the treatise "Sanhedrin," they were not to be admitted as witnesses; and according to the treatise "Aboda Zara," succor must not be given to shepherds and heathen. Ἀγραυλεῖν, properly, to make his ἀγρός his αὐλή, his field his abode. Columella ("De re rusticâ") describes these αὐλαί as inclosures surrounded by high walls, sometimes covered in, and sometimes *sub dio* (open to the sky). As it is said in a passage in the Talmud that the flocks are kept in the open air during the portion of the year between the Passover and the early autumnal rains, it has been inferred from this narrative of the shepherds that Jesus must have been born during the summer. Wieseler, however, observes that this Talmudic determination of the matter applies to the season passed by the flocks out on the steppes, far away from human dwellings. The flocks in this case were not so. In the expression φυλάσσειν φυλακάς, the plural φυλακάς perhaps denotes that they watched in turns. The genitive τῆς νυκτός must be taken adverbially: the watch, such as is kept by night. Ἰδού (ver. 9) is omitted by the Alex But it is probably authentic; it depicts the surprise of the shepherds. Ἐπέστη does not signify that the angel stood above them (comp. ἐπιστᾶσα, ver. 38). It is our *survenir* (to come unexpectedly). We must translate, as in 1 : 11, *an angel*, not *the angel* This is proved by the article ὁ at ver. 10 (see 1 : 13). By *the glory of the Lord* must be here understood, as generally, the supernatural light with which God appears, whether personally or by His representatives.

Vers. 10–12.† The angel first announces the favorable nature of his message; for at the sight of any supernatural appearance man's first feeling is fear. Ὅτις, "which, *inasmuch as great*, is intended for the whole people." Ver 11, the message itself. By the title *Saviour*, in connection with the idea of joy (ver. 10), is expressed the pity angels feel at the sight of the miserable state of mankind. The title *Christ*, anointed, refers to the prophecies which announce this Person, and the long expectation He comes to satisfy. The title *Lord* indicates that He is the representative of the divine sovereignty. This latter title applies also to His relation to the angels. The periphrasis, *the city of David*, hints that this child will be a second David. Ver. 12, the sign by means of which the shepherds may determine the truth of this message. This sign has nothing divine about it but its contrast with human glory. There could not have been many other children born that night in Bethlehem; and among these, if there were any, no other certainly would have a manger for its cradle.

Vers. 13 and 14.‡ The troop of angels issues forth all at once from the depths of that invisible world which surrounds us on every side. By their song they come to

* Ver. 9. ℵ. B. L. Z. omit ἰδου after και. ℵ^{c}. Z. It^{aliq}. Vg., Θεου instead of κυριου (second). ℵ*, επελαμψεν αυτοις instead of περελαμψεν αυτους.

† Ver. 12. B. Z. omit το before σημειον. ℵ* D. omit κειμενον. ℵ^{c} B. L. P. S. Z. some Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique} Or. add και before κειμενον (taken from ver. 16). T. R. reads τη before φατνη, with F^{g}. K. only (taken from ver. 16).

‡ Ver. 14. It^{plerique} Ir. Or., etc., omit εν before ανθρωποις. ℵ* A. B* D. It. Vg. Ir. and Or. (in the Latin translation) read ευδοκιας in place of ευδοκια.

give the key-note of the adoration of mankind. The variation of some Alex. and of the Latin translations, which read the gen. εὐδοκιας instead of the nom. εὐδοκία, is preferred in the modern exegesis : * " peace to the men of goodwill." In this case the song divides itself into two parallel propositions, whether the words *and on earth* be referred to that which precedes, " Glory to God in the highest places and on earth ; peace to the men of goodwill ;" or, which is certainly preferable, they be connected with what follows, " Glory to God in the highest places ; and on earth peace to the men of goodwill " In this second interpretation the parallelism is complete : the three ideas, peace, men, on earth, in the second member, answer to the three ideas, glory, God, in the highest places, in the first. Men make their praise arise toward God in the heavens ; God makes His peace descend toward them on the earth. The gen. εὐδοκίας, *of goodwill,* may refer to the pious dispositions toward God with which a part of mankind are animated. But this interpretation is hardly natural. Εὐδοκια, from εὐδοκειν, *to delight in*, רצע ב, denotes an entirely gracious goodwill, the initiative of which is in the subject who feels it. This terms does not suit the relation of man to God, but only that of God to man. Therefore, with this reading, we must explain the words thus : Peace on earth to the men who are the objects of divine goodwill. But this use of the genitive is singularly rude, and almost barbarous ; the *men of goodwill*, meaning those on whom goodwill rests, . . . is a mode of expression without any example. We are thus brought back to the reading of the T. R., present also in 14 Mjj., among which are L. and Z., which generally agree with the Alex., the Coptic translation, of which the same may be said, and the *Peschito.* With this reading, the song consists of three propositions, of which two are parallel, and the third forms a link between the two. In the first, glory to God in the highest places, the angels demand that, from the lower regions to which they have just come down, from the bosom of humanity, praise shall arise, which, ascending from heavens to heavens, shall reach at last the supreme sanctuary, the highest places, and there glorify the divine perfections that shine forth in this birth. The second, peace on earth, is the counterpart of the first. While inciting men to praise, the angels invoke on them peace from God. This peace is such as results from the reconciliation of man with God ; it contains the cause of the cessation of all war here below. These two propositions are of the nature of a desire or prayer. The verb understood is ἔστω, *let it be.* The third, which is not connected with the preceding by any particle, proclaims the fact which is the ground of this twofold prayer. If the logical connection were expressed, it would be by the word *for* This fact is the extraordinary favor shown to men by God, and which is displayed in the gift He is bestowing upon them at this very time. The sense is, " for God takes pleasure in men." In speaking thus, the angels seem to mean, God has not bestowed as much on us (Heb. 2 : 16). The idea of εὐδοκία, *goodwill*, recalls the first proposition, " Glory to God !" while the expression *towards men* reminds us of the second, " Peace on earth !" For the word εὐδοκία, comp. Eph. 1 : 5 and Phil. 2 : 13. When the witnesses of the blessing sing, how could they who are the objects of it remain silent ?

3. The visit of the shepherds : vers. 15–20. The angel had notified a sign to the shepherds, and invited them to ascertain its reality. This injunction they obey.

* Professor Godet uses this phrase as he elsewhere uses " criticism," and here as elsewhere controverts its conclusions.—J. H.

Vers. 15–20.* The T. R. exhibits in ver. 15 a singular expression : "And it came to pass, when the angels were gone away, . . . the men, the shepherds, said . . ." The impression of the shepherds when, the angels having disappeared, they found themselves alone among men, could not be better expressed. The omission of the words *καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι* in the Alex. is owing to the strangeness of this form, the meaning of which they did not understand. The *καὶ* before *οἱ ἄνθρωποι* is doubtless the sign of the apodosis, like the Hebrew ו ; but at the same time it brings out the close connection between the disappearance of the angels and the act of the shepherds, as they addressed themselves to the duty of obeying them. The aorist *εἶπον* of the T. R. is certainly preferable to the imperf. *ἐλάλουν* of the Alex., since it refers to an act immediately followed by a result : "They said (not *they were saying*) one to another, Let us go therefore." The term *ῥῆμα* denotes, as דבר so often does, a word in so far as accomplished (*γεγονός*). We see how the original Aramæan form is carefully preserved even to the minutest details. *Ἀνά* in *ἀνεῦρον* expresses the discovery in succession of the objects enumerated. *Ἐγνώρισαν* or *διεγνώρισαν* (Alex.), ver. 17, may signify *to verify ;* in the fifteenth verse, however, *εγνωρισαν* signifies *to make known*, and in ver. 17 it is the most natural meaning. There is a gradation here : heaven had revealed ; and now, by the care of men, publicity goes on increasing. This sense also puts the seventeenth verse in more direct connection with what follows. The compound *διαγνωρίζειν*, *to divulge*, appears to us for this reason to be preferred to the simple form (in the Alex.).

Vers. 18-20 describe the various impressions produced by what had taken place. In the eighteenth verse, a vague surprise in the greater part (all those who heard). On the other hand (*δέ*), ver. 19, a profound impression and exercise of mind in Mary. First of all, she is careful to store up all the facts in her mind with a view to preserve them (*συντηρεῖν*) ; but this first and indispensable effort is closely connected with the further and subordinate aim of comparing and combining these facts, in order to discover the divine idea which explains and connects them. What a difference between this thoughtfulness and the superficial astonishment of the people around her ! There is more in the joyful feelings and adoration of the shepherds (ver. 20) than in the impressions of those who simply heard their story, but less than in Mary. *Δοξάζειν*, *to glorify*, expresses the feeling of the greatness of the work ; *αἰνεῖν*, *to praise*, refers to the goodness displayed in it. Closely connected as they are, the two participles *heard* and *seen* can only refer to what took place in the presence of the shepherds after they reached the stable. They were told the remarkable occurrences that had preceded the birth of Jesus ; it is to this that the word *heard* refers. And they beheld the manger and the infant ; this is what is expressed by the word *seen*. And the whole was a confirmation of the angel's message to them. They were convinced that they had not been the victims of an hallucination. The reading *ὑπέστρεψαν* (they returned thence) is evidently to be preferred to the ill-supported reading of the T. R., *ἐπέστρεψαν* (they returned to their flocks).

Whence were these interesting details of the impression made on the shepherds and those who listened to their story, and of the feelings of Mary, obtained ? How can any one regard them as a mere embellishment of the author's imagination, or as

* Ver. 15. ℵ. B. L. Z. many Mnn. Syr$^{sch.}$ It^{plerique}, Vg. Or. omit *και οι ανθρωποι*. ℵ. B. It^{aliq}, *ελαλουν* instead of *ειπον*. Ver. 17. ℵ. B. D. L. Z., *εγνωρισαν* instead of *διεγνωρισαν*. Ver. 20. Instead of *επεστρεψαν*, the reading of T. R. and a part of the Mnn., all the other documents, *υπεστρεψαν*.

the offspring of legend? The Aramæan coloring of the narrative indicates an ancient source. The oftener we read the nineteenth verse, the more assured we feel that Mary was the first and real author of this whole narrative. This pure, simple, and private history was composed by her, and preserved for a certain time in an oral form until some one committed it to writing, whose work fell into the hands of Luke, and was reproduced by him in Greek.

SIXTH NARRATIVE.—CHAP. 2 : 21–40.

Circumcision and Presentation of Jesus.

This narrative comprises—1. The circumcision of Jesus (ver. 21); 2. His presentation in the temple (vers. 22–38); 3. A historical conclusion (vers. 39, 40).

1. The circumcision: ver. 21. It was under the Jewish form that Jesus was to realize the ideal of human existence. The theocracy was the surrounding prepared of God for the development of the Son of man. So to His entrance into life by birth succeeds, eight days after, His entrance into the covenant by circumcision. "Born of a woman, made under the law," says St. Paul, Gal. 4 : 4, to exhibit the connection between these two facts. There is a brevity in the account of the circumcision of Jesus which contrasts with the fuller account of the circumcision of John the Baptist (chap. 1). This difference is natural; the simply Jewish ceremony of circumcision has an importance, in the life of the latest representative of the theocracy, which does not belong to it in the life of Jesus, who only entered into the Jewish form of existence to pass through it.

Ver. 21.* The absence of the article before *ἡμέραι ὀκτώ* is due to the determinative *τοῦ περιτεμεῖν αὐτόν* which follows. In Hebrew the construct state (subst. with complement) excludes the article. The false reading of the T. R., *τὸ παιδίον* instead of *αὐτόν*, proceeds from the cause which has occasioned the greater part of the errors in this text, the necessities of public reading. As the section to be read began with this verse, it was necessary to substitute the noun for the pronoun. *Καί*, while marking the apodosis, brings out the intimate connection between the circumcision and the giving of the name. This *καί* is almost a *τότε, then*.

2. The presentation: vers. 22–38. And first the sacrifice, vers. 22–24.† After the circumcision there were two other rites to observe. One concerned the mother. Levitically unclean for eight days after the birth of a son, and for fourteen days after that of a daughter, the Israelitish mother, after a seclusion of thirty-three days in the first case, and of double this time in the second, had to offer in the temple a sacrifice of purification (Lev. 12). The other rite had reference to the child; when it was a first-born, it had to be redeemed by a sum of money from consecration to the service of God and the sanctuary. In fact, the tribe of Levi had been chosen for this office simply to take the place of the first-born males of all the families of Israel; and in order to keep alive a feeling of His rights in the hearts of the people, God had fixed a ransom to be paid for every first-born male. It was five shekels, or, reckon-

* ℵ. A. B. and 11 Mjj. 100 Mnn. It^{plerique} read *αυτον* in place of *το παιδιον*, the reading of T. R. with 6 Mjj. Syr^{sch}.

† Ver. 22. Instead of *αυτης*, which is the reading of T. R. with only some Mnn., and of *αυτου*, which is the reading of D. and 6 Mnn., all the other authorities read *αυτων*.

ng the shekel at 2*s.* 4*d.*,* nearly 12*s.* (Ex. 13 : 2 ; Num. 8 : 16, 18 : 15). Vers. 22 and 23 refer to the ransom of the child ; ver. 24 to Mary's sacrifice. Αὐτῶν, *their purification*, is certainly the true reading. This pronoun refers primarily to Mary, then to Joseph, who is, as it were, involved in her uncleanness, and obliged to go up with her. Every detail of the narrative is justified with the greatest care in the three verses by a legal prescription. The sacrifice for the mother (ver. 24) consisted properly of the offering of a lamb as a sin-offering. But when the family was poor, the offering was limited to a pair of pigeons or two turtle-doves (Lev. 12 : 8).

From the twenty-fifth verse Simeon becomes the centre of the picture : vers. 25–28 relate his coming in ; vers. 29–32, his song ; vers. 33–35, his address to the parents.

Vers. 25–28.† In times of spiritual degeneracy, when an official clergy no longer cultivates anything but the form of religion, its spirit retires among the obscurer members of the religious community, and creates for itself unofficial organs, often from the lowest classes. Simeon and Anna are representatives of this spontaneous priesthood. It has been conjectured that Simeon might be the rabbi of this name, son of the famous Hillel, and father of Gamaliel. But this Simeon, who became president of the Sanhedrim in the year 13 of our era, could hardly be the one mentioned by Luke, who at the birth of Jesus was already an old man. Further, this conjecture is scarcely compatible with the religious character of Luke's Simeon. The name was one of the commonest in Israel. The term *just* denotes positive qualities ; *fearing God*—A. V. *devout* (εὐλαβής appears to be the true reading)—watchfulness with regard to evil. The separation of πνεῦμα from ἅγιον by the verb ἦν in the greater part of the MSS. gives prominence to the idea of the adjective. An influence rested upon him, and this influence was holy. Χρηματίζειν, properly, to do business ; thence, to act officially, communicate a decision, give forth an oracle. The reading κύριον has neither probability nor authority ; κυρίου is the genitive of possession : the Christ whom Jehovah gives and sends. There are critical moments in life, when everything depends on immediate submission to the impulse of the Spirit. The words ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, *in spirit*, or *by the spirit*, do not denote a state of ecstasy, but a higher impulse. A contradiction has been found between the term γονεῖς, *parents*, and the preceding narrative of the miraculous birth ; and Meyer finds in this fact a proof that Luke avails himself here of a different document from that which he previously used. What criticism ! The word *parents* is simply used to indicate the character in which Joseph and Mary appeared at this time in the temple and presented the child. The καί of the twenty-eighth verse indicates the apodosis ; exactly as if the circumstantial ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν . . . formed a subordinate proposition ; this καί, at the same time, brings out the close connection between the act of the parents who present the child and that of Simeon, who is found there opening his arms to receive it. By the term *receive*, the text makes Simeon the true priest, who acts for the time on behalf of God.

Vers. 29–32. "Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace, according to

* Meylau, "Dictionnaire Biblique," p. 353.

† Ver. 25. ℵ* K. Γ. Π. 10 Mnn. read ευσεβης instead of εὐλαβης. Αγιον is placed after ην by ℵ. A. B. L. and 14 other Mjj. and almost all the Mnn., while the T. R. places it before ην, with D. some Mnn. It[plerique], Syr. Ver. 26. Instead of πριν η, ℵ[c]. B. and 4 Mjj., πριν η αι. ; ℵ* e., εως αν. Instead of κυριου, Λ b. c. Cop., κυριον. Ver. 28. ℵ. B. L. Π. It[aliq.] Ir. omit αυτου after αγκαλας.

Thy word : 30 For mine eyes have seen Thy salvation, 31 Which Thou hast prepared before the face of all people ; 32 A light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel."

The vivid insight and energetic conciseness which characterize this song remind us of the compositions of David. Simeon represents himself under the image of a sentinel whom his master has placed in an elevated position, and charged to look for the appearance of a star, and then announce it to the world. He sees this long-desired star ; he proclaims its rising, and asks * to be relieved of the post he has occupied so long. In the same way, at the opening of Æschylus' "Agamemnon," when the sentinel, set to watch for the appearing of the fire that is to announce the taking of Troy, beholds at last the signal so impatiently expected, he sings at once both the victory of Greece and his own release. Beneath each of these terms in ver. 29 is found the figure which we have just indicated : *νῦν, now*, that is to say, at last, after such long waiting ! The word *ἀπολύειν, to release, discharge*, contains the two ideas of relieving a sentinel on duty, and delivering from the burden of life. These two ideas are mixed up together here, because for a long time past Simeon's earthly existence had been prolonged simply in view of this special mandate. The term *δέσποτα, lord*, expresses Simeon's acknowledgment of God's absolute right over him. *Ῥῆμά σου, Thy word*, is an allusion to the word of command which the commander gives to the sentinel. The expression, *in peace*, answers to the word *now*, with which the song begins. This soul, which for a long time past has been all expectation, has now found the satisfaction it desired, and can depart from earth in perfect peace.

Vers. 30 and 31 form, as it were, a second strophe. Simeon is now free. For his eyes have seen. The term *σωτήριον*, which we can only translate by *salvation*, is equivalent neither to *σωτήρ, Saviour*, nor to *σωτηρία, salvation*. This word, the neuter of the adjective *σωτήριος, saving*, denotes an apparatus fitted to save. Simeon sees in this little child the means of deliverance which God is giving to the world. The term *prepare* is connected with this sense of *σωτήριον : we make ready* an apparatus. This notion of preparation may be applied to the entire theocracy, by which God had for a long time past been preparing for the appearance of the Messiah. But it is simpler to apply this term to the birth of the infant. The complement, *in the sight of*, must be explained in this case by an intermediate idea, "Thou hast prepared this means for placing before the eyes of . . ." that is to say, in order that all may have the advantage of it. It is a similar expression to that of Ps. 23 : 5, "Thou hast prepared a table before me." Perhaps this expression, *in the sight of all nations*, is connected with the fact that this scene took place in the court of the Gentiles. The universalism contained in these words, *all nations*, in no way goes beyond the horizon of the prophets, of Isaiah in particular (Isa. 42 : 6, 60 : 3) it is perfectly appropriate in the mouth of a man like Simeon, to whom the prophetic spirit is attributed.

The collective idea, *all people*, is divided, in the third strophe, into its two essential elements, the Gentiles and Israel. From Genesis to Revelation this is the great dualism of history, the contrast which determines its phases. The Gentiles are here placed first. Did Simeon already perceive that the salvation of the Jews could only be realized after the enlightenment of the heathen, and by this means ? We shall see what a profound insight this old man had into the moral condition of the generation

* There does not appear to be any good reason for making the words *now lettest* a prayer. The whole hymn is praise. He accepts this sight as sign of his release: *now thou art letting.*—J. H.

in which he lived. Guided by all that Isaiah had foretold respecting the future unbelief of Israel, he might have arrived at the conviction that his people were about to reject the Messiah (ver. 35). The idea of salvation is presented under two different aspects, according as it is applied to the heathen or to the Jews. To the first this child brings light, to the second glory. The heathen, in fact, are sunk in ignorance. In Isa. 25 : 7 they are represented as enveloped in a thick mist, and covered with darkness. This covering is taken away by the Messiah. The genitive *ἐθνῶν* may be regarded as a genitive of the subject, the enlightenment which the heathen receive. The heathen might also be made the object of the enlightenment, the light whereby the covering which keeps them in darkness is done away, and they themselves are brought into open day. But this second sense is somewhat forced. While the ignorant heathen receive in this child the light of divine revelation, of which they have hitherto been deprived, the humiliated Jews are delivered by Him from their reproach, and obtain the glory which was promised them. Springing from among them, Jesus appears their crown in the eyes of mankind. But this will be at the end, not at the commencement of the Messianic drama. In this song all is original, concise, enigmatical even, as the words of an oracle. In these brief pregnant sentences is contained the substance of the history of future ages. Neither the hackneyed inventions of legend, nor any preconceived dogmatic views, have any share in the composition of this joyous lyric.

Vers. 33–35.* A carnal satisfaction, full of delusive hopes, might easily have taken possession of the hearts of these parents, especially of the mother's, on hearing such words as these. But Simeon infuses into his message the drop of bitterness which no joy, not even holy joy, ever wants in a world of sin. Instead of *Joseph*, which is the reading of T. R., the Alex. read : *his father*. We should have thought that the former of these two readings was a dogmatic correction, but that at ver. 27 the T. R. itself reads the word *γονεῖς, parents*. But the Alexandrian reading is supported by the fact that the ancient translations, the *Peschito* and *Italic*, have it. Strauss finds something strange in the wonder of Joseph and Mary. Did they not already know all this? But in the first place, what Simeon has just said of the part this child would sustain toward the heathen goes beyond all that had hitherto been told them. And then especially, they might well be astonished to hear an unknown person, like Simeon, express himself about this child as a man completely initiated into the secret of His high destiny.

In the expression, *he blessed them*, ver. 34, the word *them* refers solely to the parents : the child is expressly distinguished from them (*this child*). Simeon addresses himself specially to Mary, as if he had discerned that a peculiar tie united her to the child. *Ἰδού, behold*, announces the revelation of an unexpected truth. In Isa. 8 : 14 the Messiah is represented as a rock on which believers find refuge, but whereon the rebellious are broken. Simeon, whose prophetic gift was developed under the influence of the ancient oracles, simply reproduces here this thought. The words, *is set for*, make it clear that this sifting, of which the Messiah will be the occasion, forms part of the divine plan. The images of *a fall* and *a rising again* are explained by that employed by Isaiah. The expression, *signal of contradiction* (*a sign which*

* Ver. 33. ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn., *ο πατηρ αυτου και η μητηρ αυτου*, instead of *Ιωσεφ και η μητηρ αυτου*, which is the reading of T. R. with 13 Mjj., the greater part of the Mnn. Syr. It. Ver. 35. B. L. Z. omit *δε* after *σου*. ℵ* adds *πονηροι* after *διαλογισμοι*.

shall be spoken against, A. V.), may be understood in two ways: either it is an appearing about which men argue contradictorily, or it is a sign which excites opposition directly it appears. Taken in the first sense, this expression would reproduce the ideas of a fall and a rising again, and would be a simple repetition of that which precedes; in the second sense, it would merely recall the idea of a fall, and would form the transition to what follows. Will not the general unbelief of the nation be the cause of the sad lot of the Messiah, and of the sufferings that will fill the heart of His mother? The second sense is therefore preferable. The gradation καὶ σοῦ δὲ αὐτῆς, *thy own also*, ver. 35, is in this way readily understood. The δέ of the received reading is well suited to the context. "The opposition excited by this child will go so far, that thine own heart will be pierced by it." It is natural to refer what follows to the grief of Mary, when she shall behold the rejection and murder of her son. Some such words as those of Isaiah, "He was bruised for our iniquities," and of Zechariah, "They shall look on me whom they have pierced," had enlightened Simeon respecting this mystery. Bleek has proposed another explanation, which is less natural, although ingenious: "Thou shalt feel in thine own heart this contradiction in regard to thy son, when thou thyself shalt be seized with doubt in regard to His mission." But the image of a sword must denote something more violent than simple doubt. Ψυχή, the soul, as the seat of the psychical affections, and consequently of maternal love. It has been thought that the following proposition, *in order that the thoughts of many . . .* could not be connected with that which immediately precedes; and for this reason some have tried to treat it as a parenthesis, and connect the *in order that* with the idea, *This is set . . .* (ver. 34). But this violent construction is altogether unnecessary. The hatred of which Jesus will be the object (ver. 34), and which will pierce the heart of Mary with poignant grief (ver. 35), will bring out those hostile thoughts toward God which in this people lie hidden under a veil of pharisaical devotion. Simeon discerned, beneath the outward forms of Jewish piety, their love of human glory, their hypocrisy, avarice, and hatred of God; and he perceives that this child will prove the occasion for all this hidden venom being poured forth from the recesses of their hearts. *In order that* has the same sense as *is set for*. God does not will the evil; but he wills that the evil, when present, should show itself: this is an indispensable condition to its being either healed or condemned. Πολλῶν, *of many*, appears to be a pronoun, the complement of καρδιῶν (*the hearts of many*) rather than an adjective (of *many* hearts); comp. Rom. 5:16. The term διαλογισμοί, *thoughts*, has usually an unfavorable signification in the N. T.; it indicates the uneasy working of the understanding in the service of a bad heart. The epithet πονηροί, added by the Sinaiticus, is consequently superfluous. These words of Simeon breathe a concentrated indignation. We feel that this old man knows more about the moral condition of the people and their rulers than he has a mind to tell.

Vers. 36–38.* Anna presents, in several respects, a contrast to Simeon. The latter came into the temple impelled by the Spirit; Anna lives there. Simeon has

* Ver. 37. ℵ. A. B. L. Z. It$^{\text{aliq}}$, εως instead of ως. ℵ*, εβδομηκοντα instead of ογδοηκοντα. The Alex. omit απο του ιερου. Ver. 38. 9 Mjj. (Alex.) some Mnn., και αυτη τη, instead of και αυτη αυτη τη. A. B. D. L. X. Z., τω Θεω, instead of τω κυριω, the reading of T. R. with 14 Mjj. all the Mnn. Syr. It$^{\text{plerique}}$. ℵ. B. Z. some Mnn. It$^{\text{plerique}}$, Syr$^{\text{sch}}$. Ir. omit εν between λυτρωσιν and Ιερουσαλημ, which is the reading of T. R., with 15 Mjj., the greater part of the Mnn., etc.

no desire but to die ; Anna seems to recover the vigor of youth to celebrate the Messiah. The words ἡ οὐκ ἀφίστατο (ver. 37) might be made the predicate of ἦν, and the two αυτη which separate them, two appositions of Ἄννα. But it is simpler to understand ἦν in the sense of *there was*, or *there was there*, and to regard ἡ οὐκ ἀφιστατο as an appendix intended to bring back the narrative from the description of Anna's person to the actual fact. Meyer, who understands ἦν in the same way, begins a fresh proposition with the αὕτη which immediately follows, and assigns to it ἀνθωμολογειτο for its verb (ver. 38). This construction is less natural, especially on account of the intermediate clauses (ver. 37). Προβεβηκυῖα ἐν is a Hebraism (especially with πολλαῖς), 1 : 7. The moral purity of Anna is expressed by the term παρθενία, *virginity*, and by the long duration of her widowhood. Do the 84 years date from her birth, or from the death of her husband? In the latter case, supposing that she was married at 15, she would have been 106 years old. This sense is not impossible, and it more easily accounts perhaps for such a precise reckoning. Instead of ὡς, *about*, the Alex. read ἕως, *until*, a reading which appears preferable ; for the restriction *about* would only be admissible with a round number—80, for example. Did Anna go into the temple in the morning, to spend the whole day there? or did she remain there during the night, spreading her poor pallet somewhere in the court? Luke's expression is compatible with either supposition. What he means is, that she was dead to the outer world, and only lived for the service of God. We could not, with Tischendorf, following the Alex., erase one of the two αυτη (ver. 38). Both can be perfectly accounted for, and the omission is easily explained by the repetition of the word. Ἀντί, in the compound ἀνθωμολογεῖτο, might refer to a kind of antiphony between Anna and Simeon. But in the LXX. this compound verb corresponds simply to הודה (Ps. 79 : 13) ; ἀντί only expresses, therefore, the idea of payment in acknowledgment which is inherent in an act of thanksgiving (as in the French word *reconnaissance*). The Alex. reading τῷ Θεῷ, *to God*, is probably a correction, arising from the fact that in the O. T. the verb ἀνθωμολογεῖσθαι never governs anything but God. It is less natural to regard the received reading as resulting from the pronoun αὐτοῦ, *Him*, which follows. We need not refer the imperf., *she spake*, merely to the time then present ; she was doing it continually. The reading of some Alex., "those who were looking for the deliverance of Jerusalem," is evidently a mistaken imitation of the expression, *the consolation of Israel* (ver. 25). The words, *in Jerusalem*, naturally depend on the participle, *that looked for*. The people were divided into three parties. The Pharisees expected an outward triumph from the Messiah : the Sadducees expected nothing ; between them were the true faithful, who expected the consolation, that is, deliverance. It was these last, who, according to Ezekiel's expression (chap. 9), cried for all the abominations of Jerusalem, that were represented by Anna and Simeon ; and it was among these that Anna devoted herself to the ministry of an evangelist. If Luke had sought, as is supposed, occasions for practising his muse, by inventing personages for his hymns, and hymns for his personages, how came he to omit here to put a song into the mouth of Anna, as a counterpart to Simeon's?

3. Historical conclusion : vers. 39, 40.* It is a characteristic feature of Luke's narrative, and one which is preserved throughout, that he exhibits the various actors

* Ver. 39. Some Alex., παντα instead of απαντα. Others, κατα instead of τα κατα. ℵ. B. Z., επεστρεψαν instead of υπεστρεψαν. Ver. 40. ℵ. B. D. L. It^{plerique}, Vg. Or., omit πνευματι after εκραταιουτο, which is the reading of T. R., with 14 Mjj., all the Mnn. Syr. It$^{aliq.}$ ℵ^{c}. B. L., σοφια instead of σοφιας.

in the evangelical drama as observing a scrupulous fidelity to the law (1 : 6, 2 : 22–24, 23 : 56) It is easy also to understand why Marcion, the opponent of the law, felt obliged to mutilate this writing in order to adapt it to his system. But what is less conceivable is, that several critics should find in such a Gospel the monument of a tendency systematically opposed to Jewish Christianity. The fact is, that in it the law always holds the place which according to history it ought to occupy. It is under its safeguard that the transition from the old covenant to the new is gradually effected. It is easy to perceive that ver. 39 has a religious rather than a chronological reference. "They returned to Nazareth only after having fulfilled every prescription of the law." Ver. 40 contains a short sketch of the childhood of Jesus, answering to the similar sketch, 1 : 66, of that of John the Baptist. It is probably from this analogous passage that the gloss πνεύματι, *in spirit*, has been derived. It is wanting in the principal Alex. and Græco-Latin documents. The expression *He grew* refers to His physical development. The next words, *He waxed strong*, are defined by the words *being filled*, or more literally, *filling Himself with wisdom;* they refer to His spiritual, intellectual, and religious development. The wisdom which formed the leading feature of this development (in John the Baptist it was strength) comprises, on the one hand, the knowledge of God; on the other, a penetrating understanding of men and things from a divine point of view. The image (*filling Himself* appears to be that of a vessel, which, while increasing in size, fills itself, and, by filling itself, enlarges so as to be continually holding more. It is plain that Luke regards the development, and consequently the humanity, of Jesus as a reality. Here we have the normal growth of man from a physical and moral point of view. It was accomplished for the first time on our earth. God therefore regarded this child with perfect satisfaction, because His creative idea was realized in Him. This is expressed by the last clause of the verse. Χάρις, the divine *favor*. This word contrasts with χεὶρ, *the hand*, 1 : 66. The accus. ἐπ' αὐτό marks the energy with which the grace of God rested on the child, penetrating His entire being. This government contrasts with that of 1 : 66, μετ' αὐτοῦ, which only expresses simple co-operation. This description is partly taken from that of the young Samuel (1 Sam. 2 : 26); only Luke omits here the idea of human favor, which he reserves for ver. 52, where he describes the young man. Let any one compare this description, in its exquisite sobriety, with the narratives of the infancy of Jesus in the apocryphal writings, and he will feel how authentic the tradition must have been from which such a narrative as this was derived.

SEVENTH NARRATIVE.—CHAP. 2 : 41–52.

The Child Jesus at Jerusalem.

The following incident, the only one which the historian relates about the youth of Jesus, is an instance of that wisdom which marked His development. Almost all great men have some story told about their childhood, in which their future destiny is foreshadowed. Here we have the first glimpse of the spiritual greatness Jesus exhibited in His ministry. Three facts: 1. The separation (vers. 41–45); 2. The reunion (vers. 46–50); 3. The residence at Nazareth (vers. 51, 52).

1. The separation: vers. 41–45.* The idea of fidelity to the law is prominent

* Ver. 41. ℵ*, εθος instead of ετος. Ver. 42. ℵ. A. B. K. L. X. Π., αναβαινοντων

also in this narrative. According to Ex. 23 : 17, Deut. 16 : 16, men were to present themselves at the sanctuary at the three feasts of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles. There was no such obligation for women. But the school of Hillel required them to make at least the Passover pilgrimage. The term γονεῖς, *parents,* is found at ver. 41 in all the MSS., even in those in which it does not occur at vers. 27 and 43, which proves that in these passages it was not altered with any dogmatic design. Ver. 42. It was at the age of twelve that the young Jew began to be responsible for legal observances, and to receive religious instruction ; he became then a son of the law. The partic. pres. of the Alex. reading, ἀναβαινόντων, must be preferred to the aor. partic. of the T. R., ἀναβάντων. The present expresses a habit ; the aor. is a correction suggested by the aor. partic. which follows. The words εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα should be erased, according to the Alex. reading, which evidently deserves the preference. It is a gloss easily accounted for. The words, *after the custom of the feast,* perhaps allude to the custom of going up in caravans. Jesus spent these seven days of the feast in holy delight. Every rite spoke a divine language to His pure heart ; and His quick understanding gradually discovered their typical meaning. This serves to explain the following incident. An indication of wilful and deliberate disobedience has been found in the term ὑπέμεινεν, *He abode.* Nothing could be further from the historian's intention (ver. 51). The notion of perseverance contained in this verb alludes simply to Jesus' love for the temple, and all that took place there. It was owing to this that, on the day for leaving, He found Himself unintentionally separated from the band of children to which He belonged. When once left behind, where was He to go in this strange city ? The home of a child is the house of his father. Very naturally, therefore, Jesus sought His in the temple. There He underwent an experience resembling Jacob's (Gen. 28). In His solitude, He learned to know God more familiarly as His Father. Is not the freshness of a quite recent intuition perceptible in His answer (ver. 49) ? The Alex. reading οἱ γονεῖς has against it, besides the Alex. A. and C., the *Italic* and *Peschito* translations. It was only in the evening, at the hour of encampment, when every family was gathered together for the night, that the absence of the child was perceived. When we think of the age of Jesus, and of the unusual confidence which such a child must have enjoyed, the conduct of His parents in this affair presents nothing unaccountable. The partic. pres. *seeking Him* (ver. 45) appears to indicate that they searched for Him on the road while returning.

2. The meeting : vers. 46–50.* As it is improbable that they had sought for Jesus for two or three days without going to the temple, the three days must certainly date from the time of separation. The first was occupied with the journey, the second with the return, and the third with the meeting. Lightfoot, following the Talmud, mentions three synagogues within the temple inclosure : one at the gate of the court of the Gentiles ; another at the entrance of the court of the Israelites ; a third in the famous peristyle *lischchat hagasith,* in the S. E. part of the inner court.†

instead of αναβαντων. ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn. Syr^{sch}. omit εις Ιεροσολυμα. Ver. 43. ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn. read εγνωσαν οι γονεις αυτου instead of εγνω Ιωσεφ και η μητηρ αυτου. Ver. 45. ℵ. B. C. D. L. some Mnn. omit αυτον. ℵ^{c}. B. C. D. L., αναζητουντες instead of ζητουντες.

* Ver. 48. ℵ* B. ζητουμεν instead of εζητουμεν. Ver. 49. ℵ* b. Syr^{cur}, ζητειτε instead of εζητειτε.

† Hor. hebr ad Luc. ii. 46 (after Sanhedr. xi. 2).

It was there that the Rabbins explained the law. Desire for instruction led Jesus thither. The following narrative in no way attributes to Him the part of a doctor. In order to find support for this sense in opposition to the text, some critics have alleged the detail: *seated in the midst of the doctors.* The disciples, it is said, listened around. This opinion has been refuted by Vitringa;* and Paul's expression (Acts 22 : 3), *seated at the feet of Gamaliel*, would be sufficient to prove the contrary. Nevertheless the expression, *seated in the midst of the doctors*, proves no doubt that the child was for the time occupying a place of honor. As the Rabbinical method of teaching was by questions—by proposing, for example, a problem taken from the law—both master and disciples had an opportunity of showing their sagacity. Jesus had given some remarkable answer, or put some original question; and, as is the case when a particularly intelligent pupil presents himself, He had attracted for the moment all the interest of His teachers. There is nothing in the narrative, when rightly understood, that savors in the least of an apotheosis of Jesus. The expressions, *hearing them, and asking them questions*, bear in a precisely opposite direction. Josephus, in his autobiography (c. i.), mentions a very similar fact respecting his own youth. When he was only fourteen years of age, the priests and eminent men of Jerusalem came to question him on the explanation of the law. The apocryphal writings make Jesus on this occasion a professor possessing omniscience.† There we have the legend grafted on the fact so simply related by the evangelist. Σύνεσις, *understanding*, is the personal quality of which the answers, ἀποκρίσεις, are the manifestations. The surprise of His parents proves that Jesus habitually observed a humble reserve. There is a slight tone of reproach in the words of Mary. She probably wished to justify herself for the apparent negligence of which she was guilty. Criticism is surprised at the uneasiness expressed by Mary; did she not know who this child was? Criticism reasons as if the human heart worked according to logic. To the indirect reproach of Mary, Jesus replies in such words as she had never heard from Him before: *Wherefore did ye seek me?* He does not mean, "You could very well leave me at Jerusalem." The literal translation is, "What is it, that you sought me?" And the implied answer is, "To seek for me thus was an inadvertence on your part. It should have occurred to you at once that you would find me here." The sequel explains why. The phrase τι ὅτι is found in Acts 5 : 9. Οὐκ ἤδειτε, *did ye not know?* not, do ye not know? The expression τὰ τοῦ πατρός μου may, according to Greek usage, have either a local meaning, *the house of*, or a moral, *the affairs of*. The former sense is required by the idea of seeking; and if, nevertheless, we are disposed to adopt the latter as wider, the first must be included in it. "Where my Father's affairs are carried on, there you are sure to find me." The expression *my Father* is dictated to the child by the situation: a child is to be found at his father's. We may add that He could not, without impropriety, have said *God's*, instead of *my Father's;* for this would have been to exhibit in a pretentious and affected way the entirely religious character of His ordinary thoughts, and

* Synag. p. 167.

† In the Gospel of Thomas (belonging to the second century; known to Irenæus), Jesus, when on the road to Nazareth, returns of His own accord to Jerusalem; the doctors are stupefied with wonder at hearing Him solve the most difficult questions of the law and the prophecies. In an Arabic Gospel (of later date than the preceding), Jesus instructs the astronomers in the mysteries of the celestial spheres, and reveals to the philosophers the secrets of metaphysics.

to put Himself forward as a little saint. Lastly, does not this expression contain a delicate but decisive reply to Mary's words, *Thy Father and I?* Any allusion to the Trinitarian relation must, of course, be excluded from the meaning of this saying. But, on the other hand, can the simple notion of moral paternity suffice to express its meaning? Had not Jesus, during those days of isolation, by meditating anew upon the intimacy of His moral relations with God, been brought to regard Him as the sole author of His existence? And was not this the cause of the kind of shudder which He felt at hearing from Mary's lips the word *Thy father*, to which He immediately replies with a certain ardor of expression, *my Father?* That Mary and Joseph should not have been able to understand this speech appears inexplicable to certain critics—to Meyer, for instance, and to Strauss, who infers from this detail that the whole story is untrue. But this word, *my Father*, was the first revelation of a relation which surpassed all that Judaism had realized; and the expression, "to be about the business" of this Father, expressed the ideal of a completely filial life, of an existence entirely devoted to God and divine things, which perhaps at this very time had just arisen in the mind of Jesus, and which we could no more understand than Mary and Joseph, if the life of Jesus had never come before us. It was only by the light Mary received afterward from the ministry of her Son, that she could say what is here expressed: that she did not understand this saying at the time. Does not the original source of this narrative discover itself in this remark? From whom else could it emanate, but from Mary herself?

3. The residence at Nazareth: vers. 51, 52.* From this moment Jesus possesses within Him this ideal of a life entirely devoted to the kingdom of God, which had just flashed before His eyes. For eighteen years He applied Himself in silence to the business of His earthly father at Nazareth, where He is called *the carpenter* (Mark 6 : 3). The analytical form ἦν ὑποτασσόμενός indicates the permanence of this submission; and the pres. partic. mid., *submitting Himself*, its spontaneous and deliberate character. In this simple word, *submitting Himself*, Luke has summed up the entire work of Jesus until His baptism. But why did not God permit the child to remain in the temple of Jerusalem, which during the feast-days had been His Eden? The answer is not difficult. He must inevitably have been thrown too early into the theologico-political discussions which agitated the capital; and after having excited the admiration of the doctors, He would have provoked their hatred by His original and independent turn of thought. If the spiritual atmosphere of Nazareth was heavy, it was at least calm; and the labors of the workshop, in the retirement of this peaceful valley, under the eye of the father, was a more favorable sphere for the development of Jesus than the ritualism of the temple and the Rabbinical discussions of Jerusalem. The remark at the end of ver. 51 is similar to that at ver. 19; only for the verb συντηρεῖν, which denoted the grouping of a great number of circumstances, to collect and combine them, Luke substitutes here another compound διατηρεῖν. This δια denotes the permanence of the recollection, notwithstanding circumstances which might have effaced it, particularly the inability to understand recorded in ver. 50. She carefully kept in her possession this profound saying as an unexplained mystery. The fifty-second verse describes the youth of Jesus, as the fortieth verse had depicted His childhood; and these two brief sketches correspond with the two analogous pictures

* Ver. 51. The MSS and Vss. are divided between και η μητηρ and η δε μητηρ. ℵ* B. D. M. omit ταυτα. Ver. 52. ℵ. L. add εν τη, B. εν, before σοφια. D. L. Syr. Ital[erique] place ηλικια before σοφια.

of John the Baptist (1 : 66, 80). Each of these general remarks, if it stood alone might be regarded, as Schleiermacher has suggested, as the close of a small document. But their relation to each other, and their periodical recurrence, demonstrate the unity of our writing. This form is met with again in the book of the Acts. Ἡλικία does not here denote age, which would yield no meaning at all, but height, stature, just as 19 : 3. This term embraces the entire physical development, all the external advantages ; σοφία, *wisdom*, refers to the intellectual and moral development. The third term, *favor with God and men*, completes the other two. Over the person of this young man there was spread a charm at once external and spiritual ; it proceeded from the favor of God, and conciliated toward Him the favor of men. This perfectly normal human being was the beginning of a reconciliation between heaven and earth. The term wisdom refers rather to *with God ;* the word stature to *with men.* The last words, *with men*, establish a contrast between Jesus and John the Baptist, who at this very time was growing up in the solitude of the desert ; and this contrast is the prelude to that which later on was to be exhibited in their respective ministries. There is no notion for the forgetfulness or denial of which theology pays more dearly than that of a development in pure goodness. This positive notion is derived by biblical Christianity from this verse. With it the humanity of Jesus may be accepted, as it is here presented by Luke, in all its reality.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ON CHAPS. 1 AND 2.

It remains for us to form an estimate of the historical value of the accounts contained in these two chapters.

I. *Characteristics of the Narrative.* — We have already observed that Luke thoroughly believes that he is relating facts, and not giving poetical illustrations of ideas. He declares that he only writes in accordance with the information he has collected ; he writes with the design of convincing his readers of the unquestionable certainty of the things which he relates (1 : 3, 4) ; and in speaking thus, he has very specially in view the contents of the first two chapters (comp. the ἄνωθεν, ver. 3). In short, the very nature of these narratives admits of no other supposition (p. 42). Was he himself the dupe of false information ? Was he not in a much more favorable position than we are for estimating the value of the communications that were made to him ? There are not two ways, we imagine, of replying to these preliminary questions. As to the substance of the narrative, we may distinguish between the facts and the discourses or songs. The supernatural element in the facts only occurs to an extent that may be called natural, when once the supernatural character of the appearance of Jesus is admitted in a general way. If Mary was to accept spontaneously the part to which she was called, it was necessary that she should be informed of it beforehand. If angels really exist, and form a part of the kingdom of God, they were interested as well as men in the birth of Him who was to be the Head of this organization, and reign over the whole moral universe. It is not surprising, then, that some manifestation on their part should accompany this event. That the prophetic Spirit might have at this epoch representatives in Israel, can only be disputed by denying the existence and action of this Spirit in the nation at any time. From the point of view presented by the biblical premisses, the possibility of the facts related is then indisputable. In the details of the history, the supernatural is confined

within the limits of the strictest sobriety and most perfect suitability, and differs altogether in this respect from the marvels of the apocryphal writings.*

The discourses or hymns may appear to have been a freer element, in the treatment of which the imagination of the author might have allowed itself larger scope. Should not these portions be regarded as somewhat analogous to those discourses which the ancient historians so often put into the mouth of their heroes, a product of the individual or collective Christian muse? But we have proved that, in attributing to the angel, to Mary, and to Zacharias the language which he puts into their mouths, the author would of his own accord have made his characters false prophets. They would be so many oracles *post eventum contra eventum!* Never, after the unbelief of the people had brought about a separation between the Synagogue and the Church, could the Christian muse have celebrated the glories of the Messianic future of Israel, with such accents of artless joyous hope as prevail in these canticles (1 : 17, 54, 55, 74, and 75 ; 2 : 1, 32). The only words that could be suspected from this point of view are those which are put into the mouth of Simeon. For they suppose a more distinct view of the future course of things in Israel. But, on the other hand, it is precisely the hymn of Simeon, and his address to Mary, which, by their originality, conciseness, and energy, are most clearly marked with the stamp of authenticity. We have certainly met with some expressions of a universalist tendency in these songs ("goodwill toward men," 2 : 14 ; "a light of the Gentiles," ver. 32) ; but these allusions in no way exceed the limits of ancient prophecy, and they are not brought out in a sufficiently marked way to indicate a time when Jewish Christianity and Paulinism were already in open conflict. This universalism is, in fact, that of the early days, simple, free, and exempt from all polemical design. It is the fresh and normal unfolding of the flower in its calyx.

The opinion in closest conformity with the internal marks of the narrative, as well as with the clearly expressed intention of the writer, is therefore certainly that which regards the facts and discourses contained in these two chapters as historical.

II. *Relation of the Narratives of Chaps.* 1 *and* 2 *to the Contents of other parts of the N. T.*—The first point of comparison is the narrative of the infancy in Matthew, chaps. 1 and 2. It is confidently asserted that the two accounts are irreconcilable. We ask, first of all, whether there are two accounts. Does what is called the narrative of Matthew really deserve this name? We find in the first two chapters of Matthew five incidents of the infancy of Christ, which are mentioned solely to connect with them five prophetic passages, and thus prove the Messianic dignity of Jesus, in accordance with the design of this evangelist, 1 : 1 : Jesus, the Christ. Is this what we should call a narrative? Is it not rather a didactic exposition? So little does the

* In addition to the specimens already given, we add the following, taken from the Gospel of James (2d c.) : Zacharias is high priest ; he inquires of God respecting the lot of the youthful Mary, brought up in the temple. God Himself commands that she shall be confided to Joseph. The task of embroidering the veil of the temple is devolved upon Mary by lot. When she brings the work, Elizabeth at the sight of her praises the mother of the Messiah, without Mary herself knowing why. Afterward it is John, more even than Jesus, who is the object of Herod's jealous search. Elizabeth flees to the desert with her child ; a rock opens to receive them ; a bright light reveals the presence of the angel who guards them. Herod questions Zacharias, who is ignorant himself where his child is. Zacharias is then slain in the temple court ; the carpets of the temple cry out ; a voice announces the avenger ; the body of the martyr disappears ; only his blood is found changed into stone.

author entertain the idea of relating, that in chap. 1, while treating of the birth of Jesus, he does not even mention Bethlehem : he is wholly taken up with the connection of the fact of which he is speaking with the oracle, Isa. 7. It is only after having finished this subject, when he comes to speak of the visit of the magi, that he mentions for the first time, and as it were in passing (Jesus being born in Bethlehem) this locality. And with what object? With a historical view? Not at all. Simply on account of the prophecy of Micah, which is to be illustrated in the visit of the magi, and in which the place of the Messiah's birth was announced beforehand. Apart from this prophecy, he would still less have thought of mentioning Bethlehem in the second narrative than in the first. And it is this desultory history, made up of isolated facts, referred to solely with an apologetic aim, that is to be employed to criticise and correct a complete narrative such as Luke's! Is it not clear that, between two accounts of such a different nature, there may easily be found blanks which hypothesis alone can fill up? Two incidents are common to Luke and Matthew : the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem, and His education at Nazareth. The historical truth of the latter piece of information is not disputed. Instead of this, it is maintained that the former is a mere legendary invention occasioned by Mic. 5. But were it so, the fact would never occur in the tradition entirely detached from the prophetic word which would be the very soul of it. But Luke does not contain the slightest allusion to the prophecy of Micah. It is only natural, therefore, to admit that the first fact is historical as well as the other. With this common basis, three differences are discernible in which some find contradictions.

First. The account which Matthew gives of the appearance of an angel to Joseph, in order to relieve his perplexity, is, it is said, incompatible with that of the appearance of the angel to Mary in Luke. For if this last appearance had taken place Mary could not have failed to have spoken of it to Joseph, and in that case his doubts would have been impossible. But all this is uncertain. For, first, Mary may certainly have told Joseph everything, either before or after her return from Elizabeth ; but in this case, whatever confidence Joseph had in her, nothing could prevent his being for a moment shaken by doubt at hearing of a message and a fact so extraordinary. But it is possible also—and this supposition appears to me more probable—that Mary, judging it right in this affair to leave everything to God, who immediately directed it, held herself as dead in regard to Joseph. And, in this case, what might not have been his anxiety when he thought he saw Mary's condition? On either of these two possible suppositions, a reason is found for the appearance of the angel to Joseph.

Second. It would seem, according to Matthew, that at the time Jesus was born, His parents were residing at Bethlehem, and that this city was their permanent abode. Further, on their return from Egypt, when they resolved to go and live at Nazareth, their decision was the result of a divine interposition which aimed at the fulfilment of the prophecies (Matt. 2 : 22, 23). In Luke, on the contrary, the ordinary abode of the parents appears to be Nazareth. It is an exceptional circumstance, the edict of Augustus, that takes them to Bethlehem. And consequently, as soon as the duties, which have called them to Judæa and detained them there, are accomplished, they return to Nazareth, without needing any special direction (2 : 39). It is important here to remember the remark which we made on the nature of Matthew's narrative. In that evangelist, neither the mention of the place of birth nor of the place where Jesus was brought up is made as a matter of history ; in both cases it is solely a question of proving the fulfilment of a prophecy. An account of this kind with-

out doubt affirms what it actually says, but it in no way denies what it does not say; and it is impossible to derive from it a historical view sufficiently complete, to oppose it to another and more detailed account that is decidedly historical. There is nothing, therefore, here to prevent our completing the information furnished by Matthew from that supplied by Luke, and regarding Nazareth with the latter as the natural abode of the parents of Jesus. What follows will complete the solution of this difficulty.

Third. The incidents of the visit of the magi and the flight into Egypt, related by Matthew, cannot be intercalated with Luke's narrative, either before the presentation of the child in the temple—His parents would not have been so imprudent as to take Him back to Jerusalem after that the visit of the magi had drawn upon Him the jealous notice of Herod; and besides, there would not be, during the six weeks intervening between the birth and the presentation, the time necessary for the journey to Egypt—or after this ceremony; for, according to Luke 2 : 39, the parents return directly from Jerusalem to Nazareth, without going again to Bethlehem, where nevertheless they must have received the visit of the magi; and according to Matthew himself, Joseph, after the return from Egypt, does not return to Judæa, but goes immediately to settle in Galilee. But notwithstanding these reasons, it is not impossible to place the presentation at Jerusalem, either after or before the visit of the magi. If this had already taken place, Joseph and Mary must have put their trust in God's care to protect the child; and the time is no objection to this supposition, as Wieseler has shown. For from Bethlehem to Rhinocolure, the first Egyptian town, is only three or four days' journey. Three weeks, then, would, strictly speaking, suffice to go and return. It is more natural, however, to place the visit of the magi and the journey into Egypt after the presentation. We have only to suppose that after this ceremony Mary and Joseph returned to Bethlehem, a circumstance of which Luke was not aware, and which he has omitted. In the same way, in the Acts, he omits Paul's journey into Arabia after his conversion, and combines into one the two sojourns at Damascus separated by this journey. This return to Bethlehem, situated at such a short distance from Jerusalem, is too natural to need to be particularly accounted for. But it is completely accounted for, if we suppose that, when Joseph and Mary left Nazareth on account of the census, they did so with the intention of settling at Bethlehem. Many reasons would induce them to this decision. It might appear to them more suitable that the child on whom such high promises rested should be brought up at Bethlehem, the city of His royal ancestor, in the neighborhood of the capital, than in the remote hamlet of Nazareth. The desire of being near Zacharias and Elizabeth would also attract them to Judæa. Lastly, they would thereby avoid the calumnious judgments which the short time that elapsed between their marriage and the birth of the child could not have failed to occasion had they dwelt at Nazareth. Besides, even though this had not been their original plan, after Joseph had been settled at Bethlehem for some weeks, and had found the means of subsistence there, nothing would more naturally occur to his mind than the idea of settling down at the place. In this way the interposition of the angel is explained, who in Matthew induces him to return to Galilee. Bleek inclines to the opinion that the arrival of the magi preceded the presentation, and that the journey into Egypt followed it. This supposition is admissible also; it alters nothing of importance in the course of things as presented in the preceding explanations, of which we give a sketch in the following recapitulation :

1. The angel announces to Mary the birth of Jesus (Luke 1). 2. Mary, after or without having spoken to Joseph, goes to Elizabeth (Luke 1). 3. After her return, Joseph falls into the state of perplexity from which he is delivered by the message of the angel (Matt. 1). 4. He takes Mary ostensibly for his wife (Matt. 1). 5. Herod's order, carrying out the decree of Augustus, leads them to Bethlehem (Luke 2). 6. Jesus is born (Matt. 1 ; Luke 2). 7. His parents present Him in the temple (Luke 2). 8. On their return to Bethlehem, they receive the visit of the magi and escape into Egypt (Matt. 2) 9 Returned from Egypt, they give up the idea of settling at Bethlehem, and determine once more to fix their abode at Nazareth.

Only one condition is required in order to accept this effort to harmonize the two accounts—namely, the supposition that each writer was ignorant of the other's narrative But this supposition is allowed by even the most decided adversaries of any attempt at harmony—such, for instance, as Keim, who, although he believes that Luke in composing his Gospel made use of Matthew, is nevertheless of opinion that the first two chapters of Matthew's writing were not in existence at the time when Luke availed himself of it for the composition of his own.

If the solution proposed does not satisfy the reader, and he thinks he must choose between the two writings, it will certainly be more natural to suspect the narrative of Matthew, because it has no proper historical aim. But further, it will only be right, in estimating the value of the facts related by this evangelist, to remember that the more forced in some cases appears the connection which he maintains between the facts he mentions and the prophecies he applies to them, the less probable is it that the former were invented on the foundation of the latter. Such incidents as the journey into Egypt and the massacre of the children must have been well-ascertained facts before any one would think of finding a prophetic announcement of them in the words of Hosea and Jeremiah, which the author quotes and applies to them

We pass on to other parts of the N. T. Meyer maintains that certain facts subsequently related by the synoptics themselves are incompatible with the reality of the miraculous events of the infancy How could the brethren of Jesus, acquainted with these prodigies, refuse to believe in their brother? How could even Mary herself share their unbelief? (Mark 3 : 21, 31 *et seq.* ; Matt. 12 : 46 *et seq.* ; Luke 8 19 *et seq.* , comp. John 7 . 5.) In reply, it may be said that we do not know how far Mary could communicate to her sons, at any rate before the time of Jesus' ministry, these extraordinary circumstances, which touched on very delicate matters affecting herself. Besides, jealousy and prejudice might easily counteract any impression produced by facts of which they had not been witnesses, and induce them to think, notwithstanding, that Jesus was taking a wrong course. Did not John the Baptist himself, although he had given public testimony to Jesus, as no one would venture to deny, feel his faith shaken in view of the unexpected course which His work took? and did not this cause him to be offended in Him? (Matt. 11 : 6.) As to Mary, there is nothing to prove that she shared the unbelief of her sons. If she accompanies them when they go to Jesus, intending to lay hold upon Him (Mark 3), it is probably from a feeling of anxiety as to what might take place, and from a desire to prevent the conflict she anticipates. Keim alleges the omission of the narratives of the infancy in Mark and John. These two evangelists, it is true, make the starting-point of their narrative on this side of these facts. Mark opens his with the ministry of the forerunner, which he regards as the true commencement of that of

Jesus.* But it does not follow from this that he denies all the previous circumstances which he does not relate. All that this proves is, that the original apostolic preaching, of which this Gospel is the simplest reproduction, went no further back ; and for this manifest reason, that this preaching was based on the tradition of the apostles as eye-witnesses (αὐτόπται, 1 : 2 ; Acts 1 : 21, 22 ; John 15 : 27), and that the personal testimony of the apostles did not go back as far as the early period of the life of Jesus. It is doubtless for the same reason that Paul, in his enumeration of the testimonies to the resurrection of Jesus, omits that of the women, because he regards the testimony of the apostles and of the Church gathered about them as the only suitable basis for the official instruction of the Church. John commences his narrative at the hour of the birth of his own faith, which simply proves that the design of his work is to trace the history of the development of his own faith and of that of his fellow-disciples. All that occurred previous to this time—the baptism of Jesus, the temptation—he leaves untold ; but he does not on that account deny these facts, for he himself alludes to the baptism of Jesus.

Keim goes further. He maintains that there are to be found in the N. T. three theories as to the origin of the person of Christ, which are exclusive of each other : *First.* That of the purely natural birth ; this would be the true view of the apostles and primitive Church, which was held by the Ebionitish communities (Clement. Homil.). This being found insufficient to explain such a remarkable sequel as the life of Jesus, it must have been supplemented afterward by the legend of the descent of the Holy Spirit at the baptism. *Second.* That of the miraculous birth, held by part of the Jewish-Christian communities and the Nazarene churches, and proceeding from an erroneous Messianic application of Isa. 7. This theory is found in the Gospel of Luke and in Matt. 1 and 2. *Third.* The theory of the pre-existence of Jesus as a divine being, originated in the Greek churches, of which Paul and John are the principal representatives. To this we reply :

First. That it cannot be proved that the apostolic and primitive doctrine was that of the natural birth. Certain words are cited in proof which are put by the evangelists in the mouth of the people : " Is not this the carpenter's son ?" (Matt. 13 : 55 : Luke 4 : 22 ; comp. John 6 : 42) ; next the words of the Apostle Philip in John : " We have found . . . Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph" (John 1 : 45). The absence of all protest on the part of John against this assertion of Philip's is regarded as a confirmation of the fact that he himself admitted its truth. But who could with any reason be surprised that, on the day after Jesus made the acquaintance of His first disciples, Philip should still be ignorant of the miraculous birth ? Was Jesus to hasten to tell this fact to those who saw Him for the first time ? Was there nothing more urgent to teach these young hearts just opening to His influence ? Who cannot understand why Jesus should allow the words of the people to pass, without announcing such a fact as this to these cavilling, mocking Jews ? Jesus testifies before all what He has seen with His Father by the inward sense, and not outward facts which He had from the fallible lips of others. Above all, He very well knew that it was not faith in His miraculous birth that would produce faith in His person ; on the contrary, that it was only faith in His person that would induce any one to admit the miracle of His birth. He saw that, to put out before a hostile and profane people

* These words, *The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God* (Mark 1 : 1), appear to me to be in logical apposition with the subsequent account of the ministry of John (5 : 4).

an assertion like this, which He could not possibly prove, would only draw forth a flood of coarse ridicule, which would fall directly on that revered person who was more concerned in this history even than Himself, and that without the least advantage to the faith of any one. Certainly this was a case for the application of the precept, *Cast not your pearls before swine*, if you would not have them *turn again and rend you*. This observation also explains the silence of the apostles on this point in the Acts of the Apostles. They could not have done anything more ill-advised than to rest the controversy between the Jews and Christ on such a ground. If John does not rectify the statements of the people and of Philip, the reason is, that he wrote for the Church already formed and sufficiently instructed. His personal conviction appears from the following facts: He admitted the human birth, for he speaks several times of His mother. At the same time he regarded natural birth as the means of the transmission of sin: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." And nevertheless he regarded this Jesus, born of a human mother, as the *Holy One of God*, and the *bread that came down from heaven!* Is it possible that he did not attribute an exceptional character to His birth? As to Mark, we do not, with Bleek, rely upon the name *Son of Mary*, which is given to Jesus by the people of Nazareth (6 : 3); this appellation in their mouth does not imply a belief in the miraculous birth. But in the expression, Jesus Christ, *the Son of God* (1 : 1), the latter title certain implies more, in the author's mind, than the simple notion of *Messiah;* this, in fact, was already sufficiently expressed by the name *Christ*. There can be no doubt, therefore, that this term implies in Mark a relation of mysterious Sonship between the person of Jesus and the Divine Being.* All these passages quoted by Keim only prove what is self-apparent, that the notion of the natural birth of Jesus was that of the Jewish people, and also of the apostles in the early days of their faith, before they received fuller information. It is not at all surprising, therefore, that it remained the idea of the Ebionitish churches, which never really broke with the Israelitish past, but were contented to apply to Jesus the popular notion of the Jewish Messiah. Keim also finds a trace of this alleged primitive theory in the two genealogies contained in Luke and Matthew. According to him, these documents imply, by their very nature, that those who drew them up held the idea of a natural birth. For what interest could they have had in giving the genealogical tree of Joseph, unless they had regarded him as the father of the Messiah? Further, in order to make these documents square with their new theory of the miraculous birth, the two evangelists have been obliged to subject them to arbitrary revision, as is seen in the appendix ᾧς ἦν . . . Matt. 1 : 16, and in the parenthesis ὡς ἐνομίζετο, Luke 3 : 23. It is very possible, indeed, that the original documents, reproduced in Matt. 1 and Luke 3, were of Jewish origin: they were probably the same public registers (δέλτοι δημόσιαι) from which the historian Josephus asserts that his own genealogy was taken.† It is perfectly obvious that such documents could contain no indication of the miraculous birth of Jesus, if even they went down to Him. But how could this fact furnish a proof of the primitive opinion of the Church about the birth of its Head? It is in these genealogies, as revised and completed by Christian historians, that we must seek the sentiments of the primitive Church respecting the person of her Master. And this is precisely what we find in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. The former,

* If the Sinaiticus suppresses it, this is one of the numberless omissions, resulting from the negligence of the copyist, with which this manuscript abounds.

† "Jos. Vita," c. i.

in demonstrating, by the genealogy which he presents to us, the Davidic sonship of Joseph, declares that, as regards Jesus, this same Joseph sustains part of the adoptive, legal father. The extract from the public registers which the second hands down is not another edition of that of Joseph, in contradiction with the former ; it is the genealogy of Levi, the father of Mary (see 1 : 23). In transmitting this document, Luke is careful to observe that the opinion which made Jesus the son of Joseph was only a popular prejudice, and that the relationship of which he here indicates the links is the only real one. These are not, therefore, Jewish-Christian materials, as Keim maintains, but purely Jewish ; and the evangelists, when inserting them into their writings, have imprinted on them, each after his own manner, the Christian seal.

Keim relies further on the silence of Paul respecting the miraculous birth. But is he really silent? Can it be maintained that the expression, Rom. 1 : 3, "made of the seed of David according to the flesh," was intended by Paul to describe the entire fact of the human birth of Jesus? Is it not clear that the words, *according to the flesh*, are a restriction expressly designed to indicate another side to this fact, the action of another factor, called in the following clause *the spirit of holiness*, by which he explains the miracle of the resurrection? The notion of the miraculous birth appears equally indispensable to explain the antithesis, 1 Cor. 15 : 47 : "The first man is of the earth, earthy ; the second, from heaven." But whatever else he is, Paul is a man of logical mind. How then could he affirm, on the one hand, the hereditary transmission of sin and death by natural generation, as he does in Rom. 5 : 12, and on the other the truly human birth of Jesus (Gal. 4 : 4), whom he regards as the Holy One, if, in his view, the birth of this extraordinary man was not of an exceptional character? Only, as this fact could not, from its very nature, become the subject of apostolical testimony, nor for that reason enter into general preaching. Paul does not include it among the elements of the παράδοσις which he enumerates, 1 Cor. 15 : 1 *et seq.* And if he does not make any special dogmatic use of it, it is because, as we have observed, the miraculous birth is only the negative condition of the holiness of Jesus ; its positive condition is, and must be, his voluntary obedience ; consequently it is this that Paul particularly brings out (Rom. 8 : 1–4). These reasons apply to the other didactic writings of the N. T.

Second. It is arbitrary to maintain that the narrative of the descent of the Holy Spirit is only a later complement of the theory of the natural birth. Is not this narrative found in two of our synoptics by the side of that of the supernatural birth? And yet this is only a complement of the theory of the natural birth! Further, in all these synoptics alike, it is found closely and organically connected with two other facts, the ministry of John and the temptation, which proves that these three narratives formed a very firmly connected cycle in the evangelical tradition, and belonged to the very earliest preaching.

Third. The idea of the pre-existence of Jesus is in no way a rival theory to that of the miraculous birth ; on the contrary, the former implies the latter as its necessary element. It is the idea of the natural birth which, if we think a little, appears incompatible with that of the incarnation. M. Secretan admirably says : "Man represents the principle of individuality, of progress ; woman, that of tradition, generality, species. The Saviour could not be the son of a particular man ; He behoved to be the son of humanity, the Son of man." *

* "La Raison et le Christianisme," pp. 259 and 277.

Fourth. So far from there being in the N. T. writings traces of three opposite theories on this point, the real state of the case is this: The disciples set out, just as the Jewish people did, with the idea of an ordinary birth; it was the natural supposition (John 1 : 45). But as they came to understand the prophetic testimony, which makes the Messiah the supreme manifestation of Jehovah, and the testimony of Jesus Himself, which constantly implies a divine background to His human existence, they soon rose to a knowledge of the God-man, whose human existence was preceded by His divine existence This step was taken, in the consciousness of the Church, a quarter of a century after the death of Jesus. The Epistles of Paul are evidence of it (1 Cor. 8 : 6; Col. 1 · 15–17; Phil. 2 : 6, 7). Lastly, the mode of transition from the divine existence to the human life, the fact of the miraculous birth, entered a little later into the sphere of the ecclesiastical world, by means of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, about thirty-five or forty years after the departure of the Saviour.

III. *Connection between these Narratives and the Christian Faith in general.*—The miraculous birth is immediately and closely connected with the perfect holiness of Christ, which is the basis of the Christology; so much so, that whoever denies the former of these miracles must necessarily be led to deny the latter; and whoever accepts the second cannot fail to fall back on the first, which is indeed implied in it. As to the objection, that even if the biblical narrative of the miraculous birth is accepted, it is impossible to explain how it was that sin was not communicated to Jesus through His mother, it has been already answered (p. 93). The miraculous birth is equally inseparable from the fact of the incarnation. It is true that the first may be admitted and the second rejected, but the reverse is impossible. The necessity for an exceptional mode of birth results from the pre-existence (p. 160). But here we confront the great objection to the miraculous birth: What becomes, from this point of view, of the real and proper humanity of the Saviour? Can it be reconciled with this exceptional mode of birth? "The conditions of existence being different from ours," says Keim, "equality of nature no longer exists." But, we would ask those who reason in this way, do you admit the theories of Vogt respecting the origin of the human race? Do you make man proceed from the brute? If not, then you admit a creation of the human race; and in this case you must acknowledge that the conditions of existence in the case of the first couple were quite different from ours. Do you, on this ground, deny the full and real humanity of the first man? But to deny the human character to the being from whom has proceeded by way of generation, that is to say, by the transmission of his own nature, all that is called man, would be absurd. Identity of nature is possible, therefore, notwithstanding a difference in the mode of origin. To understand this fact completely, we need to have a complete insight into the relation of the individual to the species, which is the most unfathomable secret of nature. But there is something here still more serious. Jesus is not only the continuator of human nature as it already exists; He is the elect of God, by whom it is to be renewed and raised to its destined perfection. In Him is accomplished the new creation, which is the true end of the old. This work of a higher nature can only take place in virtue of a fresh and immediate contact of creative power with human nature. Keim agrees with this up to a certain point; for while holding the paternal concurrence in the birth of this extraordinary man, he admits a divine interposition which profoundly influenced and completely sanctified the appearance of this Being.* This attempt at explanation is an homage

* "Gesch. Jesu," t. i. pp. 357, 358.

rendered to the incomparable moral greatness of Jesus, and we think it leaves untouched the great object of faith—Jesus Christ's dignity as the Saviour. But must we not retort upon this explanation the objection which Keim brings against the two notions of the pre-existence and the supernatural birth: "These are theories, not facts established by any documents!" If it is absolutely necessary to acknowledge that Jesus was a man specifically different from all others,* and if, in order to explain this phenomenon, it is indispensable to stipulate, as Keim really does, for an exceptional mode of origin, then why not keep to the positive statements of our Gospels, which satisfy this demand, rather than throw ourselves upon pure speculation?

IV. *Origin of the Narratives of the Infancy.*—The difference of style, so absolute and abrupt, between Luke's preface (1 : 1–4) and the following narratives, leaves no room for doubt that from 1 : 5 the author makes use of documents of which he scrupulously preserves the very form. What were these documents? According to Schleiermacher, they were brief family records which the compiler of the Gospel contented himself with connecting together in such a way as to form a continuous narrative. But the modes of conclusion, and the general views which appear as recurring topics, in which Schleiermacher sees the proof of his hypothesis, on the contrary upset it. For these brief summaries, by their resemblance and correspondence, prove a unity of composition in the entire narrative. Volkmar regards the sources of these narratives as some originally Jewish materials, into which the author has infused his own Pauline feeling. According to Keim, their source would be the great Ebionitish writing which constitutes, in his opinion, the original trunk of our Gospel, on which the author set himself to graft his Paulinism. These two suppositions come to the same thing. We are certainly struck with the twofold character of these narratives; there is a spirit of profound and scrupulous fidelity to the law, side by side with a not less marked universalist tendency. But are these really two currents of contrary origin? I think not. The old covenant already contained these two currents—one strictly legal, the other to a great extent universalist. Universalism is even, properly speaking, the primitive current; legalism was only added to it afterward, if it is true that Abraham preceded Moses. The narratives of the infancy reflect simply and faithfully this twofold character; for they exhibit to us the normal transition from the old to the new covenant. If the so-called Pauline element had been introduced into it subsequently, it would have taken away much more of the original tone, and would not appear organically united with it; and if it were only the product of a party manœuvre, its polemical character could not have been so completely disguised. These two elements, as they present themselves in these narratives, in no way prove, therefore, two sources of an opposite religious nature.

The true explanation of the origin of Luke's and Matthew's narrative appears to me to be found in the following fact. In Matthew, Joseph is the principal personage. It is to him that the angel appears; he comes to calm his perplexities; it is to him that the name of Jesus is notified and explained. If the picture of the infancy be represented, as in a stereoscope, in a twofold form, in Matthew it is seen on the side of Joseph: in Luke, on the contrary, it is Mary who assumes the principal part. It is she who receives the visit of the angel; to her is communicated the name of the child; her private feelings are brought out in the narrative; it is she who is prominent in the address of Simeon and in the history of the search for the child. The picture is the same, but it is taken this time on Mary's side.

* "Gesch. Jesu," t. i. p. 359.

From this we can draw no other conclusion than that the two cycles of narratives emanate from two different centres. One of these was the circle of which Joseph was the centre, and which we may suppose consisted of Cleopas his brother, James and Jude his sons, of whom one was the first bishop of the flock at Jerusalem; and Simeon, a son of Cleopas, the first successor of James. The narratives preserved among these persons might easily reach the ear of the author of the first Gospel, who doubtless lived in the midst of this flock; and his Gospel, which, far more than Luke's, was the record of the official preaching, was designed to reproduce rather that side of the facts which up to a certain point already belonged to the public. But a cycle of narratives must also have formed itself round Mary, in the retreat in which she ended her career. These narratives would have a much more private character, and would exhibit more of the inner meaning of the external facts. These, doubtless, are those which Luke has preserved. How he succeeded in obtaining access to this source of information, to which he probably alludes in the ἄνωθεν (1 : 3), we do not know. But it is certain that the nature of these narratives was better suited to the private character of his work. Does not Luke give us a glimpse, as it were designedly, of this incomparable source of information in the remarks (2 : 19, and 50, 51) which, from any other point of view, could hardly be anything else than a piece of charlatanism?

We think that these two cycles of narratives existed for a certain time—the one as a public tradition, the other as a family souvenir, in a purely oral form. The author of the first Gospel was doubtless the first who drew up the former, adapting it to the didactic aim which he proposed to himself in his work. The latter was originally in Aramæan, and under any circumstances could only have been drawn up, as we have shown, after the termination of the ministry of Jesus. It was in this form that Luke found it. He translated it, and inserted it in his work. The very songs had been faithfully preserved until then. For this there was no need of the stenographer. Mary's heart had preserved all; the writer himself testifies as much, and he utters no vain words. The deeper feelings are, the more indelibly graven on the soul are the thoughts which embody them; and the recollection of the peculiar expressions in which they find utterance remains indissolubly linked with the recollection of the thoughts themselves. Every one has verified this experience in the graver moments of his life.

Lastly, in the question which now occupies our attention, let us not forget to bear in mind the importance which these narratives possessed in the view of the two writers who have handed them down to us. They wrote seriously, because they were believers, and wrote to win the faith of the world.

SECOND PART.

THE ADVENT OF THE MESSIAH.

CHAP. 3 : 1 ; 4 : 13.

FOR eighteen years Jesus lived unknown in the seclusion of Nazareth. His fellow-townsmen, recalling this period of His life, designate Him *the carpenter* (Mark 6 : 3). Justin Martyr—deriving the fact, doubtless, from tradition—represents Jesus as making ploughs and yokes, and teaching men righteousness by these products of His peaceful toil.* Beneath the veil of this life of humble toil, an inward development was accomplished, which resulted in a state of perfect receptivity for the measureless communication of the Divine Spirit. This result was attained just when Jesus reached the climacteric of human life, the age of thirty, when both soul and body enjoy the highest degree of vitality, and are fitted to become the perfect organs of a higher inspiration. The forerunner then having given the signal, Jesus left His obscurity to accomplish the task which had presented itself to Him for the first time in the temple, when He was twelve years of age, as the ideal of His life—the establishment of the kingdom of God on the earth. Here begins the second phase of His existence, during which He gave forth what He had received in the first.

This transition from private life to public activity is the subject of the following part, which comprises four sections : 1. The ministry of John the Baptist (3 : 1–20) ; 2. The baptism of Jesus (vers. 21, 22) ; 3. The genealogy (vers. 23–38) ; 4. The temptation (4 : 1–13). The corresponding part in the two other synoptics embraces only numbers 1, 2, and 4. We shall have no difficulty in perceiving the connection between these three sections, and the reason which induced St. Luke to intercalate the fourth.

FIRST NARRATIVE.—CHAP. 3 : 1–20.

The Ministry of John the Baptist.

We already know from 1 : 77 why the Messiah was to have a forerunner. A mistaken notion of salvation had taken possession of Israel. It was necessary that a man clothed with divine authority should restore it to its purity before the Messiah labored to accomplish it. Perhaps no more stirring character is presented in sacred history than that of John the Baptist. The people are excited at his appearing ; their consciences are aroused ; multitudes flock to him. The entire nation is filled with solemn expectation ; and just at the moment when this man has only to speak the word to make himself the centre of this entire movement, he not only refrains from saying this word, but he pronounces another. He directs all the eager glances that

* "Dial. c. Tryph." c. 88.

were fixed upon himself to One coming after him, whose sandals he is not worthy to carry. Then, as soon as his successor has appeared, he retires to the background, and gives enthusiastic expression to his joy at seeing himself eclipsed. Criticism is fertile in resources of every kind; but with this unexampled moral phenomenon to account for, it will find it difficult to give any satisfactory explanation of it, without appealing to some factor of a higher order.

Luke begins by framing the fact which he is about to relate in a general outline of the history of the time (vers. 1 and 2). He next describes the personal appearance of John the Baptist (vers. 3–6); he gives a summary of his preaching (vers. 7–18); and he finishes with an anticipatory account of his imprisonment (vers. 19, 20).

1. Vers 1 and 2 * In this concise description of the epoch at which John appeared, Luke begins with the largest sphere—that of the empire. Then, by a natural transition furnished by his reference to the representative of imperial power in Judæa, he passes to the special domain of the people of Israel; and he shows us the Holy Land divided into four distinct states. After having thus described the political situation, he sketches in a word the ecclesiastical and religious position, which brings him to his subject. It cannot be denied that there is considerable skill in this preamble. Among the evangelists, Luke is the true historian.

And first the empire. Augustus died on the 19th of August of the year 767 U.C., corresponding to the year 14 and 15 of our era. If Jesus was born in 749 or 750 U.C., He must have been at this time about eighteen years of age. At the death of Augustus, Tiberius had already, for two years past, shared his throne. The fifteenth year of his reign may consequently be reckoned, either from the time when he began to share the sovereignty with Augustus, or from the time when he began to reign alone, upon the death of the latter. The Roman historians generally date the reign of Tiberius from the time when he began to reign alone. According to this mode of reckoning, the fifteenth year would be the year of Rome 781 to 782, that is to say, 28 to 29 of our era. But at this time Jesus would be already thirty-two to thirty-three years of age, which would be opposed to the statement 3 : 23, according to which He was only thirty years old at the time of His baptism, toward the end of John's ministry. According to the other mode of reckoning, the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius would be the year of Rome 779 to 780, 26 to 27 of our era. Jesus would be about twenty-nine years old when John the Baptist appeared; and supposing that the public ministry of the latter lasted six months or a year, He would be about thirty years of age when He received baptism from him. In this way agreement is established between the two chronological data, 3 : 1 and 23. It has long been maintained that this last mode of reckoning, as it is foreign to the Roman writers, could only be attributed to Luke to meet the requirements of harmonists. Wieseler, however, has just proved, by inscriptions and medals, that it prevailed in the East, and particularly at Antioch,† whence Luke appears originally to have come, and where he certainly resided for some time.

* Ver. 1. ℵ* omits Ιτουραιας . . . Αυσανιου (confusion of the two της). Ver. 2. Instead of αρχιεωεων, which is the reading of T. R. with some Mnn. It^{plerique}, Vg. all the Mjj., etc., read αρχιερεως.

† "Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien," etc., 1869, pp. 191–194. As to seeing, with him, in the terms καισαρ (instead of Augustus) and ηγεμονια (instead of μοναρχια) proofs of the co-regency of Tiberius, these are subtleties in which it is impossible for us to follow this scholar.

The circle narrows. We return to the Holy Land. The title of Pontius Pilate was properly *ἐπίτροπος*, *procurator*. That of *ἡγεμών* belonged to the superior, the governor of Syria. But as, in Judæa, the military command was joined to the civil authority, the procurator had a right to the title of *ἡγεμών*. Upon the deprivation of Archelaus, son of Herod, in the year 6 of our era, Judæa was united to the empire. It formed, with Samaria and Idumea, one of the districts of the province of Syria. Pilate was its fifth governor. He arrived there in the year 26, or sooner, in the autumn of the year 25 of our era; thus, in any case, a very short time before the ministry of John the Baptist. He remained in power ten years.

Herod, in his will, made a division of his kingdom. The first share was given to Archelaus, with the title of *ethnarch*—an inferior title to that of *king*, but superior to that of *tetrarch*. This share soon passed to the Romans. The second, which comprised Galilee and the Peræa, was that of Herod Antipas. The title of *tetrarch*, given to this prince, signifies properly *sovereign of a fourth*. It was then employed as a designation for dependent petty princes among whom had been shared (originally in fourths *) certain territories previously united under a single sceptre. Herod Antipas reigned for forty-two years, until the year 39 of our era. The entire ministry of our Lord was therefore accomplished in his reign. The third share was Philip's, another son of Herod, who had the same title as Antipas. It embraced Ituræa (Dschedur), a country situated to the south-east of the Libanus, but not mentioned by Josephus among the states of Philip, and in addition, Trachonitis and Batanæa. Philip reigned 37 years, until the year 34 of our era. If the title of *tetrarch* be taken in its etymological sense, this term would imply that Herod had made a fourth share of his states; and this would naturally be that which Luke here designates by the name of Abilene, and which he assigns to Lysanias. Abila was a town situated to the north-west of Damascus, at the foot of the Anti-Libanus. Half a century before the time of which we are writing, there reigned in this country a certain Lysanias, the son and successor of Ptolemy king of Chalcis. This Lysanias was assassinated thirty-six years before our era by Antony, who gave a part of his dominions to Cleopatra.† His heritage then passed into various hands. Profane history mentions no Lysanias after that one; and Strauss is eager to accuse Luke of having, by a gross error, made Lysanias live and reign sixty years after his death. Keim forms an equally unfavorable estimate of the statement of Luke.‡ But while we possess no positive proof establishing the existence of a Lysanias posterior to the one of whom Josephus speaks, we ought at least, before accusing Luke of such a serious error, to take into consideration the following facts: 1. The ancient Lysanias bore the title of king, which Antony had given him (Dion Cassius, xlix. 32), and not the very inferior title of tetrarch.§ 2. He only reigned from four to five years; and it would be difficult to understand how, after such a short possession, a century afterward, had Abilene even belonged to him of old, it should still have borne for this sole reason, in all the historians, the name of Abilene of Lysanias (Jos. Antiq. xviii. 6. 10, xix. 5. 1, etc.; Ptolem. v. 18). 3. A medal and an inscription found by Pococke‖ mention a

* Wieseler, work cited, p. 204.

† Jos. "Antiq." xiv. 7. 4; "Bell. Jud." i. 9. 2; "Antiq." xv. 4. 1, xiv. 13. 3.

‡ "In the third tetrarch, Lysanias of Abilene, Luke introduces a personage who did not exist" ("Gesch. Jesu," t. i. p. 618).

§ Not one of the numerous passages cited by Keim (i. p. 619, note) proves the contrary.

‖ "Morgenland," ii. 177.

P. J. LIBRARY K. C. K.

Lysanias tetrarch and high priest, titles which do not naturally apply to the ancient king Lysanias. From all these facts, therefore, it would be reasonable to conclude, with several interpreters, that there was a younger Lysanias—a descendant, doubtless, of the preceding—who possessed, not, as his ancestor did, the entire kingdom of Chalcis, but simply the tetrarchate of Abilene. This natural supposition may at the present day be asserted as a fact.* Two inscriptions recently deciphered prove: 1. That at the very time when Tiberius was co-regent with Augustus, there actually existed a tetrarch Lysanias. For it was a freedman of this Lysanias, named Nymphæus (Νύμφαιος . . . Λυσανίου τετράρχου ἀπελεύθερος), who had executed some considerable works to which one of these inscriptions refers (Boeckh's Corbus inscript. Gr. No. 4521). 2. That this Lysanias was a descendant of the ancient Lysanias.† This may be inferred, with a probability verging on certainty, from the terms of the other inscription: "and to the sons of Lysanias" (Ibid. No. 4523). Augustus took pleasure in restoring to the children what his rivals had formerly taken away from their fathers. Thus the young Jamblichus, king of Emesa, received from him the inheritance of his father of the same name, slain by Antony. In the same way, also, was restored to Archelaus of Cappadocia a part of Cilicia, which had formerly belonged to his father of the same name. Why should not Augustus have done as much for the young Lysanias, whose ancestor had been slain and deprived by Antony? That this country should be here considered by Luke as belonging to the Holy Land, is explained, either by the fact that Abilene had been temporarily subject to Herod—and it is something in favor of this supposition, that when Claudius restored to Agrippa I. all the dominions of his grandfather Herod the Great, he also gave him Abilene ‡—or by this, that the inhabitants of the countries held by the ancient Lysanias had been incorporated into the theocracy by circumcision a century before Christ, and that the ancient Lysanias himself was born of a Jewish mother, an Asmonæan, and thus far a Jew.§ This people, therefore, in a religious point of view, formed part of the holy people as well as the Idumæans. The intention of Luke in describing the dismemberment of the Holy Land at this period, is to make palpable the political dissolution into which the theocracy had fallen at the time when He appeared who was to establish it in its true form, by separating the eternal kingdom from its temporary covering.

Luke passes to the sphere of religion (ver. 2). The true reading is doubtless the sing. *ἀρχιερέως, the high priest Annas and Caiaphas.* How is this strange phrase to be explained? It cannot be accidental, or used without thought. The predecessor of Pilate, Valerius Gratus, had deposed, in the year 14, the high priest Annas. Then, during a period covering some years, four priestly rulers were chosen and deposed in succession. Caiaphas, who had the title, was son-in-law of Annas, and had been appointed by Gratus about the year 17 of our era. He filled this office until 36. It is possible that, in conformity with the law which made the high-priesthood an office for life, the nation continued to regard Annas, notwithstanding his deprivation and

* Wieseler, work quoted, pp. 191 and 202–204.

† It does not follow from the expression of Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. i. 9), recapitulating the account of Josephus, that the young Lysanias was a son of Herod. We may, and indeed, as it appears to me, we must, refer the title of *ἀδελφοί, brethren*, only to Philip and Herod the younger, and not to Lysanias: "The brothers Philip and Herod the younger, with Lysanias, governed their tetrarchies." The note in the first edition must be corrected accordingly.

‡ Jos. "Antiq" xix. 5. 1.

§ Wieseler, work quoted, p. 204.

the different elections which followed this event, as the true high priest, while all those pontiffs who had followed him were only, in the eyes of the best part of the people, titular high priests. In this way Luke's expression admits of a very natural explanation : "Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests," that is to say, the two high priests—one by right, the other in fact. This expression would have all the better warrant, because, as history proves, Annas in reality continued, as before, to hold the reins of government. This was especially the case under the pontificate of Caiaphas, his son-in-law. John indicates this state of things in a striking way in two passages relating to the trial of Jesus, 18 : 13 and 24 : "And they bound Jesus, and led Him away to Annas first ; for he was father-in-law to Caiaphas. . . . And Annas sent Jesus bound to Caiaphas, the high priest." These words furnish in some sort a commentary on Luke's expression. These two persons constituted really one and the same high priest. Add to this, as we are reminded by Wieseler, that the higher administration was then shared officially between two persons whom the Talmud always designates as distinct—the *nasi*, who presided over the Sanhedrin, and had the direction of public affairs ; and the high priest properly so called, who was at the head of the priests, and superintended matters of religion. Now it is very probable that the office of *nasi* at that time devolved upon Annas. We are led to this conclusion by the powerful influence which he exerted ; by the part which, according to John, he played in the trial of Jesus ; and by the passage, Acts 4 : 6, where he is found at the head of the Sanhedrin with the title of ἀρχιερεύς, while Caiaphas is only mentioned after him, as a simple member of this body. This separation of the office into two functions, which, united, had constituted, in the regular way, the true and complete theocratic high-priesthood, was the commencement of its dissolution. And this is what Luke intends to express by this gen. sing. ἀρχιερέως, in apposition with two proper names. It is just as if he had written : "under the high priest Annas-Caiaphas." Disorganization had penetrated beneath the surface of the political sphere (ver. 1), to the very heart of the theocracy. What a frame for the picture of the appearing of the Restorer ! The expression, *the word came to John* (lit. *came upon*), indicates a positive revelation, either by theophany or by vision, similar to that which served as a basis for the ministry of the ancient prophets : Moses, Ex. 3 ; Isaiah. chap. 6 ; Jeremiah, chap. 1 ; Ezekiel, chap. 1–3 ; comp. John 1 : 33, and see 1 : 80. The word *in the wilderness* expressly connects this portion with that last passage.

2. Vers. 3–6.* The *country about Jordan*, in Luke, doubtless denotes the arid plains near the mouth of this river. The name *wilderness of Judea*, by which Matthew and Mark designate the scene of John's ministry, applies properly to the mountainous and broken country which forms the western boundary of the plain of the Jordan (toward the mouth of this river), and of the northern part of the basin of the Dead Sea But as, according to them also, John was baptizing in Jordan, the wilderness of Judea must necessarily have included in their view the lower course of the river. As to the rest, the expression *he came into* supposes, especially if with the Alex. we erase the τήν, that John did not remain stationary, but went to and fro in the country. This hint of the Syn., especially in the form in which it occurs in

* Ver. 3. A. B. L. Or. omit την before περιχωρον. Ver. 4. ℵ. B. D. L. Δ. some Mnn. Syr$^{cur.}$ It^{plerique}, omit λεγοντος. Ver. 5. B. D. Z. some Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ Or, read ευθειας instead of ευθειαν.

Luke, agrees perfectly with John 10 : 40, where the Peræa is pointed out as the principal theatre of John's ministry.

The rite of baptism, which consisted in the plunging of the body more or less completely into water, was not at this period in use among the Jews, neither for the Jews themselves, for whom the law only prescribed lustrations, nor for proselytes from paganism, to whom, according to the testimony of history, baptism was not applied until after the fall of Jerusalem. The very title *Baptist*, given to John, sufficiently proves that it was he who introduced this rite. This follows also from John 1 : 25, where the deputation from the Sanhedrin asks him by what right he baptizes, if he is neither the Messiah nor one of the prophets, which implies that this rite was introduced by him; and further, from John 3 : 26, where the disciples of John make it a charge against Jesus, that He adopted a ceremony of which the institution, and consequently, according to them, the monopoly, belonged to their master. Baptism was a humiliating rite for the Jews. It represented a complete purification ; it was, as it were, a lustration carried to the second power, which implied in him who accepted it not a few isolated faults so much as a radical defilement. So Jesus calls it (John 3 : 5) *a birth of water*.* Already the promise *of clean water, and of a fountain opened for sin and uncleanness*, in Ezekiel (36 : 25) and Zechariah (13 : 1), had the same meaning. The complement μετανοίας, *of repentance*, indicates the moral act which was to accompany the outward rite, and which gave it its value. This term indicates a complete change of mind. The object of this new institution is sin, which appears to the baptized in a new light. According to Matthew and Mark, this change was expressed by a positive act which accompanied the baptism, the confession of their sins (ἐξομολόγησις). Baptism, like every divinely instituted ceremony, contained also a grace for him who observed it with the desired disposition. As Strauss puts it : if, on the part of man, it was a declaration of the renunciation of sin, on the part of God it was a declaration of the pardon of sins. The words *for the pardon* depend grammatically on the collective notion, baptism of repentance.

According to ver. 4, the forerunner of the Messiah had a place in the prophetic picture by the side of the Messiah Himself. It is very generally taken for granted by modern interpreters, that the prophecy Isa. 40 : 1–11, applied by the three synoptics to the times of the Messiah and to John the Baptist refers properly to the return from the exile, and pictures the entrance of Jehovah into the Holy Land at the head of His people. But is this interpretation really in accordance with the text of the prophet? Throughout this entire passage of Isaiah the people are nowhere represented as returning to their own country : they are settled in their cities ; it is God who comes to them · " O Zion, get thee up into a high mountain . . . Lift up thy voice with strength ! Say to the cities of Judah, Behold your God !" (ver. 9). So far are the people from following in Jehovah's train, that, on the contrary, they are invited by the divine messenger to prepare, in the country where they dwell, the way by which Jehovah is to come to them : " Prepare the way of the Lord . . . and His glory shall be revealed " (vers. 3 and 5). The desert to which the prophet compares the moral condition of the people is not that of Syria, which had to be

* There is, to say the least, no need to connect our Lord's words with Baptism, when they have an adequate basis in the prophecies of the Old Testament. Ezek. (36 : 25, 26) connects " clean water" and a " new heart," and in chap. 37 introduces the quickening spirit. His baptism had not yet been formulated, but Nicodemus ought to have known these things (John 3 : 10).—J. H.

crossed in returning from Babylon, a vast plain in which there are neither mountains to level nor valleys to fill up. It is rather the uncultivated and rocky hill-country which surrounds the very city of Jerusalem, into which Jehovah is to make His entry as the Messiah. If, therefore, it is indeed the coming of Jehovah as Messiah which is promised in this passage (ver. 11, "He shall feed His flock like a shepherd . . He shall carry the lambs in His arms"), the herald who invites the people to prepare the way of His God is really the forerunner of the Messiah. The image is taken from an oriental custom, according to which the visit of a sovereign was preceded by the arrival of a courier, who called on all the people to make ready the road by which the monarch was to enter.*

The text is literally : *A voice of one crying!* . . . There is no finishing verb ; it is an exclamation. The messenger is not named : his person is of so little consequence that it is lost in his message. The words *in the desert* may, in Hebrew, as in Greek, be taken either with what precedes : "cries in the desert," or with what follows : "Prepare in the desert." It matters little : the order resounds wherever it is to be executed. Must we be satisfied with a general application of the details of the picture? or is it allowable to give a particular application to them—to refer, for instance, the mountains that must be levelled to the pride of the Pharisees ; the valleys to be filled up, to the moral and religious indifference of such as the Sadducees ; the crooked places to be made straight, to the frauds and lying excuses of the publicans ; and lastly, the rough places, to the sinful habits found in all, even the best? However this may be, the general aim of the quotation is to exhibit repentance as the soul of John's baptism. It is probable that the plur. εὐθείας was early substituted for the sing. εὐθεῖαν, to correspond with the plur. τὰ σκολιά. With this adj. ὁδόν or ὁδούς must be understood.

When once this moral change is accomplished, Jehovah will appear. Καί, and *then*. The Hebrew text is : "All flesh shall see the glory of God." The LXX. have translated it : "The glory of the Lord shall be seen (by the Jews?), and all flesh (including the heathen?) shall see the salvation of God." This paraphrase, borrowed from Isa. 52 : 10, proceeded perhaps from the repugnance which the translator felt to attribute to the heathen the sight of the glory of God, although he concedes to them a share in the salvation. This term *salvation* is preserved by Luke ; it suits the spirit of his Gospel. Only the end of the prophecy (vers. 5 and 6) is cited by Luke. The two other synoptics limit themselves to the first part ver. 4. It is remarkable that all three should apply to the Hebrew text and to that of the LXX. the same modification : τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ, *His paths*, instead of τὰς τρίβους τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, *the paths of our God*. This fact has been used to prove the dependence of two of the synoptics on the third. But the proof is not valid. As Weizsäcker † remarks, this was one of the texts of which frequent use was made in the preaching of the Messiah ; and it was customary, in applying the passage to the person of the Messiah, to quote it in this form. If Luke had, in this section, one of the two other synoptics before him, how could he have omitted all that refers to the dress and mode of life of the forerunner?

3. Vers. 7–17. The following discourse must not be regarded as a particular specimen of the preaching, the substance of which Luke has transmitted to us. It is

* Lowth, "Isaiah," übers. v. Koppe, ii. p. 207.
† "Untersuchungen," p. 24, note.

a summary of all the discourses of John the Baptist during the period that preceded the baptism of Jesus. The imperf. ἔλεγεν, *he used to say*, clearly indicates Luke's intention. This summary contains—1. A call to repentance, founded on the impending Messianic judgment (vers. 7–9); 2. Special practical directions for each class of hearers (vers. 10–14); 3. The announcement of the speedy appearance of the Messiah (vers. 15–17).

Vers. 7–9. "Then said he to the multitude that came forth to be baptized of him, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? 8. Bring forth, therefore, fruits worthy of repentance, and begin not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. 9. And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees; every tree therefore which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire." What a stir would be produced at the present day by the preaching of a man, who, clothed with the authority of holiness, should proclaim with power the speedy coming of the Lord, and His impending judgment! Such was the appearance of John in Israel. The expression *that came forth* (ver. 7) refers to their leaving inhabited places to go into the desert (comp. vii. 24). In Matthew it is a number of Pharisees and Sadducees that are thus accosted. In that Gospel, the reference is to a special case, as the aor. εἶπεν, *he said to them*, shows. But for all this it may have been, as Luke gives us to understand, a topic on which John ordinarily expatiated to his hearers. The reproachful address, *generation of vipers*, expresses at once their wickedness and craft. John compares these multitudes who come to his baptism, because they regard it as a ceremony that is to insure their admission into the Messianic kingdom, to successive broods of serpents coming forth alive from the body of their dam. This severe term is opposed to the title children of Abraham, and appears even to allude to another father, whom Jesus expressly names in another place (John 8 : 37–44). Keim observes, with truth, that this figurative language of John (comp. the following images, *stones*, *trees*) is altogether the language of the desert.* What excites such lively indignation in the forerunner, is to see people trying to evade the duty of repentance by means of its sign, by baptism performed as an *opus operatum*. In this deception he perceives the suggestion of a more cunning counsellor than the heart of man. Ὑποδείκνυμι : to address advice to the ear, to suggest. The choice of this term excludes Meyer's sense : "Who has reassured you, persuading you that your title children of Abraham would preserve you from divine wrath?" The *wrath to come* is the Messiah's judgment. The Jews made it fall solely on the heathen ; John makes it come down on the head of the Jews themselves.

Therefore (ver. 8) refers to the necessity of a sincere repentance, resulting from the question in ver. 7. The *fruits worthy of repentance* are not the Christian dispositions flowing from faith ; they are those acts of justice, equity, and humanity, enumerated vers. 10–14, the conscientious practice of which leads a man to faith (Acts 10 : 35). But John fears that the moment their conscience begins to be aroused, they will immediately soothe it, by reminding themselves that they are children of Abraham. Μὴ ἀρξησθε, literally, "do not begin . . ." that is to say : "As soon as my voice awakens you, do not set about saying . . ." The μὴ δόξητε, *do not*

* Winer, "Realwörterbuch," on Jericho : "This place might have passed for a paradise, apart from the venomous serpents found there." The trees along the course of the Jordan.

think, in Matthew, indicates an illusory claim. On the abuse of this title by the Jews, see John 8 : 33–39, Rom. 4 : 1, Jas. 2 : 21. It is to the posterity of Abraham, doubtless, that the promises are made, but the resources of God are not limited. Should Israel prove wanting, with a word He can create for Himself a new people. In saying, *of these stones*, John points with his finger to the stones of the desert or on the river banks. This warning is too solemn to be only an imaginary supposition. John knew the prophecies ; he was not ignorant that Moses and Isaiah had announced the rejection of Israel and the calling of the Gentiles. It is by this threatening prospect that he endeavors to stir up the zeal of his contemporaries. This word contained in germ the whole teaching of St. Paul on the contrast between the carnal and the spiritual posterity of Abraham developed in Rom. 9 and Gal. 3. In Deuteronomy the circumcision of the flesh had already been similarly contrasted with the circumcision of the heart (30 : 6).

In vers. 7 and 8 Israel is reminded of the incorruptible *holiness* of the judgment awaiting them ; ver. 9 proclaims it *at hand*. Ἤδη δὲ καί : "*and now also.*" The image is that of an orchard full of fruit-trees. An invisible axe is laid at the trunk of every tree. This figure is connected with that of the fruits (ver. 8). At the first signal, the axe will bury itself in the trunks of the barren trees ; it will cut them down to the very roots. It is the emblem of the Messianic judgment. It applies at once to the national downfall and the individual condemnation, two notions which are not yet distinct in the mind of John. This fulminating address completely irritated the rulers, who had been willing at one time to come and hear him ; from this time they broke all connection with John and his baptism. This explains the passage (Luke 7 : 30) in which Jesus declares that the rulers refused to be baptized. This rejection of John's ministry by the official authorities is equally clear from Matt. 21 : 25 : "If we say, Of God ; he will say, Why then did ye not believe on him?" The proceeding of the Sanhedrim, John 1 : 19 *et seq.*, proves the same thing.

Vers. 10–14.* But what then, the people ask, are those fruits of repentance which should accompany baptism? And, seized with the fear of judgment, different classes of hearers approach John to obtain from him special directions, fitted to their particular social position. It is the confessional after preaching. This characteristic fragment is wanting in Matthew and Mark. Whence has Luke obtained it? From some oral or written source. But this source could not, it is evident, contain simply the five verses which follow ; it must have been a narrative of the entire ministry of John. Luke therefore possessed, on this ministry as a whole, a different document from the other two Syn. In this way we can explain the marked differences of detail which we have observed between his writing and Matthew's : *he says*, instead of *he was saying*, ver. 7 ; *do not begin*, instead of *think not*, ver. 8.

The imperf., *asked*, signifies that those questions of conscience were frequently repeated (comp. ἔλεγεν, ver. 7). To a similar question St. Peter replied (Acts 2 : 37) very differently. This was because the kingdom of God had come. The forerunner

* Ver. 10. Almost all the Mjj., ποιησωμεν instead of ποιησομεν, which is the reading of T. R., with G. K. U. and many Mnn. Ver. 11. ℵ. B. C. L. X. some Mnn., ελεγεν instead of λεγει. Ver. 12. Almost all the Mjj., ποιησωμεν instead of ποιησομεν, which is the reading of T. R., with G. U. and many Mnn. Ver. 13. ℵ* omits ειπεν προς αυτους. Ver. 14. C. D. It$^{aliq.}$, επηρωτησαν instead of επηρωτων. Almost all the Mjj., ποιησωμεν instead of ποιησομεν, which A. G. K. V. and many Mnn. read. ℵ* Il. Syr., μηδενα before συκοφαντησητε, instead of μηδε, which T. R. with all the other documents read.

contents himself with requiring the works fitted to *prepare* his hearers—those works of moral rectitude and benevolence which are in conformity with the law written in the heart, and which attest the sincerity of the horror of evil professed in baptism, and that earnest desire after good which Jesus so often declares to be the true preparation for faith (John 3 : 21). In vain does hypocrisy give itself to the practice of devotion ; it is on moral obligation faithfully acknowledged and practised that the blessing depends which leads men to salvation. There is some hesitation in the form ποιήσωμεν (deliberative subj.) ; the future ποιήσομεν indicates a decision taken. Ver. 13. Πράσσειν, *exact ;* the meaning is, no overcharge ! Who are the soldiers, ver. 14 ? Certainly not the Roman soldiers of the garrison of Judæa. Perhaps military in the service of Antipas king of Galilee ; for they came also from this country to John's baptism. More probably armed men, acting as police in Judæa. Thus the term συκοφαντεῖν admits of a natural interpretation. It signifies etymologically those who denounced the exporters of figs (out of Attica), and is applied generally to those who play the informer. Διασείειν appears to be connected with the Latin word *concutere*, whence comes also our word *concussion*. These are unjust extortions on the part of subordinates. The reading of ℵ. H. *Pesch.*, μηδένα, does not deserve the honor Tischendorf has accorded to it of admitting it into his text. When all the people shall in this way have made ready the way of the Lord, they will be that prepared people of whom the angel spoke to Zacharias (1 : 17), and the Lord will be able to bring salvation to them (3 : 6).

Vers. 15–17.* "And as the people were in expectation, and all men mused in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ or not ; 16. John answered, saying unto them all : I indeed baptize you with water ; but one mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose : He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire : 17 Whose fan is in His hand, and He will thoroughly purge His floor, and will gather the wheat into His garner ; but the chaff He will burn with fire unquenchable." This portion is common to the three Syn. But the preamble, ver. 15, is peculiar to Luke. It is a brief and striking sketch of the general excitement and lively expectation awakened by John's ministry. The ἅπασιν of the T. R. contains the idea of a solemn gathering ; but this scene is not the same as that of John 1 : 19, *et seq.*, which did not take place till after the baptism of Jesus. In his answer John asserts two things : first, that he is not the Messiah ; second, that the Messiah is following him close at hand. The art ὁ before ἰσχυρότερος denotes this personage as expected. To unloose the sandals of the master when he came in (Luke and Mark), or rather to *bring* them to him (βαστάσαι, Matt.) when he was disposed to go out, was the duty of the lowest class of slaves. Mark expresses its menial character in a dramatic way : κύψας λῦσαι, *to stoop down and unloose.* Each evangelist has thus his own shade of thought. If one of them had copied from the other, these changes, which would be at once purposed and insignificant, would be puerile. Ἱκανός may be applied either to physical or intellectual capacity, or to moral dignity. It is taken in the latter sense here. The pronoun αὐτός brings out prominently the personality of the Messiah. The preposition ἐν, which had not been employed before ὕδατι, is added before πνεύματι ; the Spirit cannot be treated as a simple means. One

* Ver. 16. ℵ. B. L., πασιν instead of απασιν. Ver. 17. ℵ* B. a. e. Heracleon, διακαθαραι instead of και διακαθαριει, which is the reading of T. R., with all the other Mjj. and all the Mnn. ℵ* B. c., συναγαγειν instead of συναξει, which all the others read.

baptizes with water, but not with the Spirit. If the pardon granted in the baptism of water was not followed by the baptism of the Spirit, sin would soon regain the upper hand, and the pardon would be speedily annulled (Matt. 18 : 23–25). But let the baptism of the Spirit be added to the baptism of water, and then the pardon is confirmed by the renewal of the heart and life. Almost all modern interpreters apply the term *fire* to the consuming ardor of the judgment, according to ver. 17, *the fire which is not quenched.* But if there was such a marked contrast between the two expressions *Spirit* and *fire,* the preposition ἐν must have been repeated before the latter. Therefore there can only be a shade of difference between these two terms. The Spirit and fire both denote the same divine principle, but in two different relations with human nature : the first, inasmuch as taking possession of all in the natural man that is fitted to enter into the kingdom of God, and consecrating it to this end ; the second—the image of fire is introduced on account of its contrariness to the water of baptism—inasmuch as consuming everything in the old nature that is out of harmony with the divine kingdom, and destined to perish. The Spirit, in this latter relation, is indeed the principle of judgment, but of an altogether internal judgment. It is the fire symbolized on the day of Pentecost. As to the fire of ver. 17, it is expressly opposed to that of ver. 16 by the epithet ἀσβεστον, *which is not quenched.* Whoever refuses to be baptized with the fire of holiness, will be exposed to the fire of wrath. Comp. a similar transition, but in an inverse sense, Mark 9 : 48, 49. John had said, *shall baptize you* (ver. 16). Since this *you* applied solely to the penitent it contained the idea of a sifting process going on among the people. This sifting is described in the seventeenth verse. The *threshing-floor* among the ancients was an uncovered place, where the corn, spread out upon the hardened ground, was trodden by oxen, which were sometimes yoked to a sledge. The straw was burned upon the spot ; the corn was gathered into the garner. This garner, in John's thought, represents the Messianic kingdom, the Church in fact, the earliest historical form of this kingdom, into which all believing Israelites will be gathered. Jewish presumption made the line of demarcation which separates the elect from the condemned pass between Israel and the Gentiles ; John makes it pass *across* the theocracy itself, of which the threshing-floor is the symbol. This is the force of the διά in διακαθαριεῖ. Jesus expresses Himself in exactly the same sense, John 3 : 18, *et seq.* The judgment of the nation and of the individual are here mingled together, as in ver. 9 ; behind the national chastisement of the fall of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the people, is placed in the background the judgment of individuals, under another dispensation. The readings διακαθᾶραι and συναγαγεῖν, *in order to purify, in order to gather,* cannot be admitted. They rather weaken the force of this striking passage ; the authority of ℵ. B. and of the two documents of the *Italic* are not sufficient ; lastly, the future κατακαύσει, which must be in opposition to a preceding future (δέ), comes in too abruptly. The pronoun αὐτοῦ, twice repeated ver. 17 (*His* threshing-floor, *His* garner), leaves no doubt about the divine dignity which John attributed to the Messiah. The theocracy belongs to Jehovah. Comp. the expression, *His* temple, Mal. 3 : 1.

4. Vers. 18–20.*—We find here one of those general surveys such as we have in 1 : 66, 80 ; 2 : 40, 52. For the third time the lot of the forerunner becomes the prelude to that of the Saviour. The expression *many other things* (ver. 18) confirms what

* Ver. 19. The T. R., with A. C. K. X. Π. many Mnn. Syr., adds, before του αδελφου, Φιλιππου, which is omitted by 16 Mjj. 120 Mnn. It. Vg. (taken from Matthew). Ver. 20. ℵ* B. D. X. It^{aliq}, omit και before προσεθηκε.

was already indicated by the imperf. *he used to say* (ver. 7), that Luke only intends to give a summary of John's preaching. The term *he evangelized* (a literal translation) refers to the Messianic promises which his discourses contained (vers. 16 and 17), and the true translation of this verse appears to me to be this: "while addressing these and many other exhortations to the people, he announced to them the glad tidings." Ver. 19. Herod Antipas, the sovereign of Galilee, is the person already mentioned in ver. 1. The word Φιλίππου, rejected by important authorities, is probably a gloss derived from Matthew. The first husband of Herodias was called Herod. He has no other name in Josephus. He lived as a private individual at Jerusalem. But perhaps he also bore the surname of Philip, to distinguish him from Herod Antipas. The brother of Antipas, who was properly called Philip, is the tetrarch of Ituræa (3 : 1). The ambitious Herodias had abandoned her husband to marry Antipas, who for love of her sent away his first wife, a daughter of Aretas king of Arabia; this act drew him into a disastrous war.

Luke's expression indicates concentrated indignation. In order to express the energy of the ἐπὶ πᾶσιν, we must say: *to crown all* . . . The form of the phrase προσέθηκε καὶ κατέκλεισε is based on a well-known Hebraism, and proves that this narrative of Luke's is derived from an Aramæan document. This passage furnishes another proof that Luke draws upon an independent source; he separates himself, in fact, from the two other synoptics, by mentioning the imprisonment of John the Baptist here, instead of referring it to a later period, as Matthew and Mark do, synchronizing it with the return of Jesus into Galilee after His baptism (Matt. 4 : 12; Mark 1 : 14). He thereby avoids the chronological error committed by the two other Syn., and rectified by John (3 : 24). This notice is brought in here by anticipation, as the similar notices, 1 : 66*b* and 80*b*. It is intended to explain the sudden end of John's ministry, and serves as a stepping-stone to the narrative 7 : 18, where John sends from his prison two of his disciples to Jesus.

The fact of John the Baptist's ministry is authenticated by the narrative of Josephus. This historian speaks of it at some length when describing the marriage of Herod Antipas with Herodias. After relating the defeat of Herod's army by Aretas, the father of his first wife, Josephus (Antiq. xviii. 5 1, 2) continues thus: "This disaster was attributed by many of the Jews to the displeasure of God, who smote Herod for the murder of John, surnamed the Baptist; for Herod had put to death this good man, who exhorted the Jews to the practice of virtue, inviting them to come to his baptism, and bidding them act with justice toward each other, and with piety toward God; for their baptism would please God if they did not use it to justify themselves from any sin they had committed, but to obtain purity of body after their souls had been previously purified by righteousness. And when a great multitude of people came to him, and were deeply moved by his discourses, Herod, fearing lest he might use his influence to urge them to revolt—for he well knew that they would do whatever he advised them—thought that the best course for him to take was to put him to death before he attempted anything of the kind. So he put him in chains, and sent him to the castle of Machærus, and there put him to death. The Jews, therefore, were convinced that his army was destroyed as a punishment for this murder, God being incensed against Herod." This account, while altogether independent of the evangelist's, confirms it in all the essential points: the extraordinary appearance of this person of such remarkable sanctity; the rite of baptism introduced by him; his surname, the *Baptist;* John's protest against the use of baptism as a mere *opus operatum;* his energetic exhortations; the general excitement; the imprisonment and murder of John; and further, the criminal marriage of Herod, related in what precedes. By the side of these essential points, common to the two narratives, there are some secondary differences: "*First.* Josephus makes no

mention of the Messianic element in the preaching of John. But in this there is nothing surprising. This silence proceeds from the same cause as that which he observes respecting the person of Jesus. He who could allow himself to apply the Messianic prophecies to Vespasian, would necessarily try to avoid everything in contemporaneous history that had reference either to the forerunner, as such, or to Jesus. Weizsäcker rightly observes that the narrative of Josephus, so far from invalidating that of Luke on this point, confirms it. For it is evident that apart from its connection with the expectation of the Messiah, the baptism of John would not have produced that general excitement which excited the fears of Herod, and which is proved by the account of Josephus. *Second.* According to Luke, the determining cause of John's imprisonment was the resentment of Herod at the rebukes of the Baptist; while, according to Josephus, the motive for this crime was the fear of a political outbreak. But it is easy to conceive that the cause indicated by Luke would not be openly avowed, and that it was unknown in the political circles where Josephus gathered his information. Herod and his counsellors put forward, as is usual in such cases, the reason of state. The previous revolts—those which immediately followed the death of Herod, and that which Judas the Gaulonite provoked—only justified too well the fears which they affected to feel. In any case, if, on account of this general agreement, we were willing to admit that one of the two historians made use of the other, it is not Luke that we should regard as the copyist; for the Aramæan forms of his narrative indicate a source independent of that of Josephus.

The higher origin of this ministry of John is proved by the two following characteristics, which are inexplicable from a purely natural point of view: *First*, His connection so emphatically announced, with the immediate appearance of the Messiah; *second*, The abdication of John, when at the height of his popularity, in favor of the poor Galilean, who was as yet unknown to all. As to the originality of John's baptism, the lustrations used in the oriental religions, in Judaism itself, and particularly among the Essenes, have been alleged against it. But this originality consisted less in the outward form of the rite, than—1. In its application to the whole people, thus pronounced defiled, and placed on a level with the heathen; and 2. In the preparatory relation established by the forerunner between this imperfect baptism and that final baptism which the Messiah was about to confer.

We think it useful to give an example here of the way in which Holtzmann tries to explain the composition of our Gospel:

1. Vers. 1–6 are borrowed from source A. (the original Mark); only Luke leaves out the details respecting the ascetic life of John the Baptist, because he intends to give his discourses at greater length; he compensates for this omission by adding the chronological data (vers. 1 and 2), and by extending the quotation from the LXX. (vers. 5 and 6)! 2. Vers. 7–9 are also taken from A., just as are the parallel verses in Matthew; they were left out by the author of our canonical Mark, whose intention was to give only an abridgment of the discourses. 3. Vers. 10–14 are taken from a private source, peculiar to Luke. Are we then to suppose that this source contained only these four verses, since Luke has depended on other sources for all the rest of his matter? 4. Vers. 15–17 are composed (*a*) of a sketch of Luke's invention (ver. 15); (*b*) of an extract from A., vers. 16, 17. 5. Vers. 18–20 have been compiled on the basis of a fragment of A., which is found in Mark 6 : 17–29, a summary of which Luke thought should be introduced here. Do we not thus fall into that process of manufacture which Schleiermacher ridiculed so happily in his work on the composition of Luke, *à propos* of Eichhorn's hypothesis, a method which we thought had disappeared from criticism for ever?

SECOND NARRATIVE.—CHAP. 3 : 21, 22.

The Baptism of Jesus.

The relation between John and Jesus, as described by St. Luke, resembles that of two stars following each other at a short distance, and both passing through a series of similar circumstances. The announcement of the appearing of the one follows close upon that of the appearing of the other. It is the same with their two births. This

relation repeats itself in the commencement of their respective ministries ; and lastly, in the catastrophes which terminate their lives. And yet, in the whole course of the career of these two men, there was but one personal meeting- -at the baptism of Jesus After this moment, when one of these stars rapidly crossed the orbit of the other, they separated, each to follow the path that was marked out for him. It is this moment of their actual contact that the evangelist is about to describe.

Vers. 21 and 22.* This narrative of the baptism is the sequel, not to vers. 18, 19 (the imprisonment of John), which are an anticipation, but to the passage, vers. 15–17, which describes the expectation of the people, and relates the Messianic prophecy of John. The expression ἅπαντα τὸν λαόν, *all the people*, ver. 21, recalls the crowds and popular feeling described in ver. 15. But Meyer is evidently wrong in seeing in these words, "When all the people were baptized," a proof that all this crowd was present at the baptism of Jesus. The term *all the people*, in such a connection, would be a strange exaggeration. Luke merely means to indicate the general agreement in time between this movement and the baptism of Jesus ; and the expression he uses need not in any way prevent our thinking that Jesus was alone, or almost alone, with the forerunner, when the latter baptized Him. Further, it is highly probable that He would choose a time when the transaction might take place in this manner. But the turn of expression, ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι, expresses more than the simultaneousness of the two facts ; it places them in moral connection with each other. In being baptized, Jesus surrenders Himself to the movement which at this time was drawing *all the people* toward God. Had He acted otherwise, would He not have broken the bond of solidarity which He had contracted, by circumcision, with Israel, and by the incarnation, with all mankind? So far from being relaxed, this bond is to be drawn closer, until at last it involve Him who has entered into it in the full participation of our condemnation and death. This relation of the baptism of the nation to that of Jesus explains also the singular turn of expression which Luke makes use of in mentioning the fact of the baptism. This act, which one would have thought would have been the very pith of the narrative, is indicated by means of a simple participle, and in quite an incidental way : "When all the people were baptized, Jesus also being baptized, and praying . . ." Luke appears to mean that, granted the national baptism, that of Jesus follows as a matter of course. It is the moral consequence of the former. This turn of thought is not without its importance in explaining the fact which we are now considering. Luke adds here a detail which is peculiar to him, and which serves to place the miraculous phenomena which follow in their true light. At the time when Jesus, having been baptized, went up out of the water, He was in prayer. The extraordinary manifestations about to be related thus become God's answer to the prayer of Jesus, in which the sighs of His people and of mankind found utterance. The earth is thirsty for the rain of heaven. The Spirit will descend on Him who knows how to ask it effectually ; and it will be His office to impart it to all the rest. If, afterward, we hear Him saying (11 : 9), "Ask, and it shall be given you ; seek, and ye shall find ; knock, and it shall be opened to you," we know from what personal experience He derived this precept : at the Jordan He Himself first asked and received, sought and found, knocked and it was opened to Him.

The heavenly manifestation. Luke assigns these miraculous facts to the domain

* Ver. 22. ℵ. B. D. L., ὡς instead of ὡσει. ℵ. B. D. L. It^{plerique}, omit λεγουσαν. D. It^{aliq}. Justin, and some other Fathers, read, υιος μου ει συ, εγω σημερον γεγεννηκα σε, εν σοι, etc.

of objective reality : *the heavens opened, the Spirit descended.* Mark makes them a personal intuition of Jesus :* "And coming up out of the water, He saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit descending" (1 : 10). Matthew corresponds with Mark ; for Bleek is altogether wrong in maintaining that this evangelist makes the whole scene a vision of John the Baptist. The text does not allow of the two verbs, *He went up* and *He saw*, which follow each other so closely (Matt. 3 : 16), having two different subjects. Bleek alleges the narrative of the fourth Gospel, where also the forerunner speaks merely of what *he saw himself.* But that is natural ; for in that passage his object was, not to relate the fact, but simply to justify the testimony which he had just borne. For this purpose he could only mention what he had *seen himself.* No inference can be drawn from this as to the fact itself, and its relation to Jesus, the other witness. Speaking generally, the scene of the baptism does not fall within the horizon of the fourth Gospel, which starts from a point of time six weeks after this event took place. Keim has no better ground than this for asserting that the accounts of the Syn. on this subject are contradictory to that of John, because the former attribute an external reality to these miraculous phenomena, while the latter treats them as a simple vision of the forerunner, and even, according to him, excludes the reality of the baptism.† The true relation of these accounts to each other is this : According to the fourth Gospel, John saw ; according to the first and second, Jesus saw. Now, as two persons can hardly be under an hallucination at the same time and in the same manner, this double perception supposes a reality, and this reality is affirmed by Luke : *And it came to pass, that* . . .

The divine manifestation comprises three internal facts, and three corresponding sensible phenomena. The three former are the divine communication itself ; the three latter are the manifestation of this communication to the consciousness of Jesus and of John. Jesus was a true man, consisting, that is, at once of body and soul. In order, therefore, to take complete possession of Him, God had to speak at once to His outward and inward sense. As to John, he shared, as an official witness of the spiritual fact, the sensible impression which accompanied this communication from on high to the mind of Jesus. The first phenomenon is *the opening of the heavens.* While Jesus is praying, with His eyes fixed on high, the vault of heaven is rent before His gaze, and His glance penetrates the abode of eternal light. The spiritual fact contained under this sensible phenomenon is the perfect understanding accorded to Jesus of God's plan in the work of salvation. The treasures of divine wisdom are opened to Him, and He may thenceforth obtain at any hour the particular enlightenment He may need. The meaning of this first phenomenon is therefore *perfect revelation.* From the measureless heights of heaven above, thus laid open to His gaze, Jesus sees descend *a luminous appearance,* having the form of a dove. This emblem is taken from a natural symbolism. The fertilizing and persevering incubation of the dove is an admirable type of the life giving energy whereby the Holy Spirit develops in the human soul the germs of a new life. It is in this way that the new creation, deposited with all its powers in the soul of Jesus, is to extend itself around Him, under the influence of this creative principle (Gen. 1 : 2). By the organic form which invests the luminous ray, the Holy Spirit is here presented in its absolute totality. At Pentecost the Holy Spirit appears under the form of *divided* (διαμεριζό-

* For the meaning of the author in this sentence, see the close of the paragraph. By itself it might be misunderstood.—J. H.

† "Gesch. Jesu," t. i. p. 535.

μεναι) tongues of fire, emblems of special gifts, of particular χαρίσματα, shared among the disciples. But in the baptism of Jesus it is not a portion only, it is the fulness of the Spirit which is given. This idea could only be expressed by a symbol taken from organic life. John the Baptist understood this emblem: "For God giveth not," he says (John 3 : 34), "the Spirit *by measure* unto Him." The vibration of the luminous ray on the head of Jesus, like the fluttering of the wings of a dove, denotes the *permanence* of the gift. "I saw," says John the Baptist (John 1 : 32), "the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and *it abode upon Him.*" This luminous appearance, then, represents an inspiration which is neither partial as that of the faithful, nor intermittent as that of the prophets—*perfect inspiration.* The third phenomenon, that of the *divine voice*, represents a still more intimate and personal communication. Nothing is a more direct emanation from the personal life than speech, the voice. The voice of God resounds in the ear and heart of Jesus, and reveals to Him all that He is to God—the Being most tenderly beloved, beloved as a father's only son; and consequently all that He is called to be to the world—the organ of divine love to men, He whose mission it is to raise His brethren to the dignity of sons. According to Luke, and probably Mark also (in conformity with the reading admitted by Tischendorf), the divine declaration is addressed *to* Jesus: "*Thou art* my Son . . .; *in Thee* I am . . ." In Matthew it has the form of a testimony addressed to a third party touching Jesus: "*This is* my Son . . . *in whom* . . ." The first form is that in which God spoke to Jesus; the second, that in which John became conscious of the divine manifestation. This difference attests that the two accounts are derived from different sources, and that the writings in which they are preserved are independent of each other. What writer would have deliberately changed the *form* of a saying which he attributed to God Himself? The pronoun σύ, *Thou*, as well as the predicate ἀγαπητος, with the article, *the well-beloved*, invest this filial relation with a character that is altogether *unique;* comp. 10 : 22. From this moment Jesus must have felt Himself the supreme object of the love of the infinite God. The unspeakable blessedness with which such an assurance could not fail to fill Him was the source of the witness He bore concerning Himself —a witness borne not for His own glory, but with a view to reveal to the world the love wherewith God loves those to whom He imparts such a gift. From this moment dates the birth of that unique consciousness Jesus had of God as *His own Father*—the rising of that radiant sun which henceforth illuminates His life, and which since Pentecost has risen upon mankind. Just as, by the instrumentality of His Word and Spirit, God communicates to believers, when the hour has come, the certainty of their adoption, so answering *both inwardly* and *outwardly* the prayer of Jesus, He raises Him in His human consciousness to a sense of His dignity as the only-begotten Son. It is on the strength of this revelation that John, who shared it, says afterward, "The Father *loveth the Son*, and hath given *all things* into His hands" (John 3 : 25). The absence of the title *Christ* in the divine salutation is remarkable. We see that the principal fact in the development of the consciousness of Jesus was not the feeling of His Messianic dignity, but of His close and personal relation with God (comp. already 2 : 49), and of His divine origin. On that alone was based His conviction of His Messianic mission. The religious fact was first; the official part was only its corollary. M. Rénan has reversed this relation, and it is the capital defect of his work. The quotation of the words of Ps. 2, "*To-day have I begotten Thee,*" which Justin introduces into the divine salutation, is only supported by D. and some

MSS. of the Italic. It contrasts with the simplicity of the narrative. God does not quote Himself textually in this way! The *Cantabrigiensis* swarms with similar interpolations which have not the slightest critical value. It is easy to understand how this quotation, affixed at an early period as a marginal gloss, should have found its way into the text of some documents; but it would be difficult to account for its suppression in such a large number of others, had it originally formed part of the text. Justin furnishes, besides, in this very narrative of the baptism, several apocryphal additions.

By means of a perfect revelation, Jesus contemplates the plan of God. Perfect inspiration gives Him strength to realize it. From the consciousness of His dignity as Son He derives the assurance of His being the supreme ambassador of God, called to accomplish this task. These were the positive conditions of His ministry.

THE BAPTISM OF JESUS.

We shall examine—1*st*. The baptism itself; 2*d*. The marvellous circumstances which accompanied it; 3*d*. The different accounts of this fact.

1*st*. *The Meaning of the Baptism*.—Here two closely connected questions present themselves: What was the object of Jesus in seeking baptism? What took place within Him when the rite was performed?

To the former question Strauss boldly replies: the baptism of Jesus was an avowal on His part of defilement, and a means of obtaining divine pardon. This explanation contradicts all the declarations of Jesus respecting Himself. If there is any one feature that marks His life, and completely separates it from all others, it is the entire absence of remorse and of the need of personal forgiveness. According to Schleiermacher, Jesus desired to indorse the preaching of John, and obtain from him consecration to His Messianic ministry. But there had been no relation indicated beforehand between the baptism of water and the mission of the Messiah, nor was any such known to the people; and since baptism was generally understood as a confession of defilement, it would rather appear incompatible with this supreme theocratic dignity. Weizsäcker, Keim, and others see in it a personal engagement on the part of Jesus to consecrate Himself to the service of holiness. This is just the previous opinion shorn of the Messianic notion, since these writers shrink from attributing to Jesus thus early, a fixed idea of His Messianic dignity. It is certain that baptism was a vow of moral purity on the part of him who submitted to it. But the form of the rite implies not only the notion of progress in holiness, but also that of the removal of actual defilement; which is incompatible with the idea which these authors have themselves formed of the person of Jesus. Lange sees in this act the indication of Jesus' guiltless participation in the collective defilement of mankind, by virtue of the solidarity of the race, and a voluntary engagement to deliver Himself up to death for the salvation of the world. This idea contains substantially the truth. We would express it thus: In presenting Himself for baptism, Jesus had to make, as others did, His ἐξομολόγησις, His confession of sins.* Of what sins, if not of those of His people and of the world in general? He placed before John a striking picture of them, not with that pride and scorn with which the Jews spoke of the sins

* Matthew (3 : 6) and Mark (1 : 7): "And they were baptized by him in Jordan, *confessing their sins*."

of the heathen, and the Pharisees of the sins of the publicans, but with the humble and compassionate tones of an Isaiah (chap. 63), a Daniel (chap. 9), or a Nehemiah (chap. 9, when they confessed the miseries of their people, as if the burden were their own. He could not have gone down into the water after such an act of communion with our misery, unless resolved to give Himself up entirely to the work of putting an end to the reign of sin. But He did not content Himself with making a vow. *He prayed*, the text tells us; He besought God for all that He needed for the accomplishment of this great task, *to take away the sin of the world*. He asked for wisdom, for spiritual strength, and particularly for the solution of the mystery which family records, the Scriptures, and His own holiness had created about His person. We can understand how John, after hearing Him *confess and pray* thus, should say, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world!" This is what Jesus did by presenting Himself for baptism.

What took place within Him during the performance of the rite? According to Schleiermacher, nothing at all. He knew that He was the Messiah, and, by virtue of His previous development, He already possessed every qualification for His work. John, His forerunner, was merely apprised of his vocation, and rendered capable of proclaiming it. Weizsäcker, Keim, and others admit something more. Jesus became at this time conscious of His redemptive mission. It was on the banks of the Jordan that the grand resolve was formed; there Jesus felt Himself at once the man of God and the man of His age; there John silently shared in His solemn vow; and there the "God wills it" sounded through these two elect souls.* Lastly, Gess and several others think they must admit, besides a communication of strength from above, the gift of the Holy Spirit, but solely as a *spirit of ministry*, in view of the charge He was about to fulfil. These ideas, although just, are insufficient. The texts are clear. If Jesus was revealed to John, it was because He was revealed to Himself; and this revelation could not have taken place without being accompanied by a new gift. This gift could not refer to His work simply; for in an existence such as His, in which all was *spirit and life*, it was impossible to make a mechanical separation between work and life. The exercise of the functions of His office was an emanation from His life, and in some respects the atmosphere of His very personality. His entrance upon the duties of His office must therefore have coincided with an advance in the development of His personal life. Does not the power of giving imply possession in a different sense from that which holds when this power is as yet unexercised? Further, our documents, accepting the humanity of Jesus more thoroughly than our boldest theologians, overstep the bounds at which they stop. According to them, Jesus really received, not certainly as Cerinthus, going beyond the limits of truth, taught, a heavenly Christ who came and united Himself to him for a time, but *the Holy Spirit*, in the full meaning of the term, by which Jesus became the Lord's anointed, the *Christ*, the perfect man, the second Adam, capable of begetting a new spiritual humanity. This spirit no longer acted *on* Him simply, on His will, as it had done from the beginning; it became His proper nature, His personal life. No mention is ever made of the action of the Holy Spirit on Jesus during the course of His ministry. Jesus was more and better than inspired. Through the spirit whose life became His life, God was in Him, and He in God. In order to His being completely glorified as man, there remained but one thing more, that His earthly existence be

* See the fine passage in Keim's "Gesch. Jesu," t. i. pp. 543–549.

transformed into the divine state. His transfiguration was the prelude to this transformation. In the development of Jesus, the baptism is therefore the intermediate point between the miraculous birth and the ascension.

But *objections* are raised against this biblical notion of the baptism of Jesus. Keim maintains that, since Jesus already possessed the Spirit through the divine influence which sanctified His birth, He could not receive it in His baptism. But would he deny that, if there is one act in human life which is free, it is the acquisition of the Spirit? The Spirit's influence is too much of the nature of fellowship to force itself on any one. It must be desired and sought in order to be received; and for it to be desired and sought, it must be in some measure known. Jesus declares (John 14:17), "that the world cannot receive the Holy Spirit, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him." The possession of the Spirit cannot therefore be the starting-point of moral life; it can only be the term of a more or less lengthened development of the soul's life. The human soul was created as the betrothed of the Spirit; and for the marriage to be consummated, the soul must have beheld her heavenly spouse, and learned to love Him and accept Him freely. This state of energetic and active receptivity, the condition of every Pentecost, was that of Jesus at His baptism. It was the fruit of His previous pure development, which had simply been rendered *possible* by the interposition of the Holy Spirit in His birth (p. 58).

Again, it is said that it lessens the moral greatness of Jesus to substitute a sudden and magical illumination, like that of the baptism, for that free acquisition of the Spirit—that spontaneous discovery and conquest of self which are due solely to personal endeavor. But when God gives a soul the inward assurance of adoption, and reveals to it, as to Jesus at His baptism, the love He has for it, does this gift exclude previous endeavor, moral struggles, even anguish often bordering on despair? No; so far from grace excluding human preparatory labor, it would remain barren without it, just as the human labor would issue in nothing apart from the divine gift. Every schoolmaster has observed marked stages in the development of children—crises in which past growth has found an end, and from which an entirely new era has taken its date. There is nothing, therefore, out of harmony with the laws of psychology in this apparently abrupt leap which the baptism makes in the life of Jesus.

2*d*. *The Miraculous Circumstances.*—Keim denies them altogether. Everything in the baptism, according to him, resolves itself into a heroic decision on the part of Jesus to undertake the salvation of the world. He alleges: 1. The numerous differences between the narratives, particularly between that of John and those of the Syn. This objection rests on misapprehensions (see above). 2. The legendary character of the prodigies related. But here one of two things must be true. Either our narratives of the baptism are the reproduction of the original evangelical tradition circulated by the apostles (1:2), and repeated during many years under their eyes; and in this case, how could they contain statements positively false? Or these accounts are legends of later invention; but if so, how is their all but literal agreement to be accounted for, and the well-defined and fixed type which they exhibit? 3. The internal struggles of Jesus and the doubts of John the Baptist, mentioned in the subsequent history, are not reconcilable with this supernatural revelation, which, according to these accounts, both must have received at the time of the baptism. But it is impossible to instance a single struggle in the ministry of Jesus respecting the reality of His mission; it is to pervert the meaning of the conversation at Cæsarea

Philippi (see 9 : 18, *et seq.*), and of the prayer in Gethsemane, to find such a meaning in them. And as to the doubts of John the Baptist, they certainly did not respect *the origin* of the mission of Jesus, since it is to none other than Jesus Himself that John applies for their solution, but solely to the *nature* of this mission. The unostentatious and peaceful progress of the work of Jesus, His miracles purely of mercy ("*having heard of the works of Christ*," Matt. 11 : 2), contrasted so forcibly with the terrible Messianic judgment which he had announced as imminent (3 : 9, 17), that he was led to ask himself whether, in accordance with a prevalent opinion of Jewish theology,* Jesus was not the messenger of grace, the instrument of salvation ; while another, a *second* (ἕτερος, Matt. 11 : 3), to come after Him, would be the agent of divine judgment, and the temporal restorer of the people purified from every corruption. John's doubt therefore respects, not the divinity of Jesus' mission, but the *exclusive* character of His Messianic dignity. 4. It is asked why John, if he believed in Jesus, did not from the hour of the baptism immediately take his place among His adherents? But had he not a permanent duty to fulfil in regard to Israel? Was he not to continue to act as a mediating agent between this people and Jesus? To abandon his special position, distinct as it was from that of Jesus, in order to rank himself among His disciples, would have been to desert his official post, and to cease to be a mediator for Israel between them and their King.

We cannot imagine for a moment, especially looking at the matter from a Jewish point of view, according to which every holy mission proceeds from above, that Jesus would determine to undertake the unheard-of task of the salvation of the world and of the destruction of sin and death, and that John could share this determination, and proclaim it in God's name a heavenly mission, without some positive sign, some sensible manifestation of the divine will. Jesus, says Keim, is not a man of visions ; He needs no such signs ; there is no need of a dove between God and Him. Has Keim, then, forgotten the real humanity of Jesus? That there were no visions during the course of His ministry, we concede ; there was no room for ecstasy in a man whose inward life was henceforth that of the Spirit Himself. But that there had been none in His preceding life up to the very threshold of this new state, is more than any one can assert. Jesus *lived over again*, if we may venture to say so, the whole life of humanity and the whole life of Israel, so far as these two lives were of a normal character ; and this was how it was that He so well understood them. Why should not the preparatory educational method of which God made such frequent use under the old covenant—the vision—have had its place in His inward development, before He reached, physically and spiritually, the stature of complete manhood?

3d. The Narratives of the Baptism.—Before we pronounce an opinion on the origin of our synoptical narratives, it is important to compare the apocryphal narrations. In the "Gospel of the Nazarenes," which Jerome had translated,† the mother and brethren of Jesus invite Him to go and be baptized by John. He answers : "Wherein have I sinned, and why should I go to be baptized by him—unless, perhaps, this speech which I have just uttered be [a sin of] ignorance?" Afterward, a heavenly voice addresses these words to Him : "My Son, in all the prophets I have waited for Thy coming, in order to take my rest in Thee : for it is Thou who art my rest ; Thou art my first-born Son, and Thou shalt reign eternally." In the *Preaching of*

* See my "Commentary on the Gospel of John," i. p. 311.
† "Adv. Pet." iii. 1.

Paul,* Jesus actually confesses His sins to John the Baptist, just as all the others. In the Ebionitish recension of the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, cited by Epiphanius,† a great light surrounds the place where Jesus has just been baptized: then the plenitude of the Holy Spirit enters into Jesus under the form of a dove, and a divine voice says to Him, "Thou art my well-beloved Son; on Thee I have bestowed my good pleasure." It resumes: "To-day have I begotten Thee." In this Gospel, also, the dialogue between Jesus and John, which Matthew relates before the baptism, is placed after it. John, after having seen the miraculous signs, says to Jesus, "Who then art Thou?" The divine voice replies, "This is my beloved Son, on whom I have bestowed my good pleasure." John falls at His feet, and says to Him, "Baptize me!" and Jesus answers him, "Cease from that." Justin Martyr relates,‡ that when Jesus had gone down into the water, a fire blazed up in the Jordan; next, that when He came out of the water, the Holy Spirit, like a dove, descended upon Him, lastly, that when He had ascended from the river, the voice said to Him, "Thou art my Son; to-day have I begotten Thee." Who cannot feel the difference between prodigies of this kind—between these theological and amplified discourses attributed to God—and the holy sobriety of our biblical narratives? The latter are the text; the apocryphal writings give the human paraphrase. The comparison of these two kinds of narrative proves that the type of the apostolic tradition has been preserved pure as the impress of a medal, in the common tenor of our synoptical narratives. As to the difference between these narratives, they are not without importance. The principal differences are these: Matthew has, over and above the two others, the dialogue between Jesus and John which preceded the baptism, and which was only a continuation of the act of confession which Jesus had just made. The Ebionite Gospel places it after, because it did not understand this connection. The prayer of Jesus is peculiar to Luke, and he differs from the other two in the remarkable turn of the participle applied to the fact of the baptism of Jesus, and in the more objective form in which the miraculous facts are mentioned. Mark differs from the others only in the form of certain phrases, and in the expression, "He saw the heavens open." Holtzmann derives the accounts of Matthew and Luke from that of the alleged original Mark, which was very nearly an exact fac-simile of our canonical Mark. But whence did the other two derive what is peculiar to them? Not from their imagination, for an earnest writer does not treat a subject which he regards as sacred in this way. Either, then, from a document or from tradition? But this document or tradition could not contain merely the detail peculiar to each evangelist; the detail implies the complete narrative. If the evangelist drew the detail from it, he most probably took from it the narrative also. Whence it seems to us to follow, that at the basis of our Syn. we must place certain documents or oral narrations, emanating from the primitive tradition (in this way their common general tenor is explained), but differing in some details, either because in the oral tradition the secondary features of the narrative naturally underwent some modification, or because the private documents underwent some alterations, owing to additional oral information, or to writings which might be accessible.

* See "De rebaptismate," in the works of Cyprian. Grabe, "Spicil." t. i. p. 69.
† "Hær." xxx. 13.
‡ "Dial. c. Tryph." c. 88 and 103.

THIRD NARRATIVE.—3 : 23–38

The Genealogy of Jesus.

In the first Gospel the genealogy of Jesus is placed at the very beginning of the narrative. This is easily explained. From the point of view indicated by theocratic forms, scriptural antecedents, and, if we may so express it, Jewish etiquette, the Messiah was to be a descendant of *David* and *Abraham* (Matt. 1 : 1). This relationship was the *sine quâ non* of His civil status. It is not so easy to understand why Luke thought he must give the genealogy of Jesus, and why he places it just here, between the baptism and the temptation. Perhaps, if we bear in mind the obscurity in which, to the Greeks, the origin of mankind was hidden, and the absurd fables current among them about *autochthonic* nations, we shall see how interesting any document would be to them, which, following the track of actual names, went back to the first father of the race. Luke's intention would thus be very nearly the same as Paul's when he said at Athens (Acts 17 · 26), "God hath made of one blood the whole human race" But from a strictly religious point of view, this genealogy possessed still greater importance. In carrying it back not only, as Matthew does, as far as Abraham, but even to Adam, Luke lays the foundation of that universality of redemption which is to be one of the characteristic features of the picture he is about to draw. In this way he places in close and indissoluble connection the imperfect image of God created in Adam, which reappears in *every* man, and His perfect image realized in Christ, which is to be reproduced in all men.

But why does Luke place this document *here?* Holtzmann replies (p 112), "because hitherto there had been no suitable place for it." This answer harmonizes very well with the process of *fabrication*, by means of which this scholar thinks the composition of the Syn. may be accounted for. But why did this particular place appear more suitable to the evangelist than another? This is what has to be explained. Luke himself puts us on the right track by the first words of ver. 23. By giving prominence to the person of Jesus in the use of the pronoun αὐτός, *He*, which opens the sentence, by the addition of the name *Jesus*, and above all, by the verb ἦν which separates this pronoun and this substantive, and sets them both in relief ("*and Himself was, He, Jesus* . . ."), Luke indicates this as the moment when Jesus enters personally on the scene to commence His proper work. With the baptism, the obscurity in which He has lived until now passes away; He now appears detached from the circle of persons who have hitherto surrounded Him and acted as His patrons—namely, His parents and the forerunner. He henceforth becomes the *He*, the principal personage of the narrative. This is the moment which very properly appears to the author most suitable for giving His genealogy. The genealogy of Moses, in the Exodus, is placed in the same way, not at the opening of his biography, but at the moment when he appears on the stage of history, when he presents himself before Pharaoh (6 : 14, *et seq.*). In crossing the threshold of this new era, the sacred historian casts a general glance over the period which thus reaches its close, and sums it up in this document, which might be called the mortuary register of the earlier humanity.

There is further a difference of form between the two genealogies. Matthew comes down, while Luke ascends the stream of generations. Perhaps this difference of method depends on the difference of religious position between the Jews and the Greeks. The Jew, finding the basis of his thought in a revelation, proceeds synthet-

ually from cause to effect ; the Greek, possessing nothing beyond the fact, analyzes it, that he may proceed from effect to cause. But this difference depends more probably still on another circumstance. Every official genealogical register must present the descending form ; for individuals are only inscribed in it as they are born. The ascending form of genealogy can only be that of a private instrument, drawn up from the public document with a view to the particular individual whose name serves as the starting-point of the whole list. It follows that in Matthew we have the exact copy of the official register ; while Luke gives us a document extracted from the public records, and compiled with a view to the person with whom the genealogy commences.

Ver. 23 is at once the transition and preamble ; vers. 24–38 contain the genealogy itself. 1st. Ver. 23.* The exact translation of this important and difficult verse is this : "And Himself, Jesus, was [aged] about thirty years when He began [or, if the term may be employed here, made His *début*], being a son, as was believed, of Joseph." The expression *to begin* can only refer in this passage to the entrance of Jesus upon His Messianic work. This idea is in direct connection with the context (baptism, temptation), and particularly with the first words of the verse. Having fully become *He*, Jesus *begins*. We must take care not to connect ἀρχόμενος and ἦν as parts of a single verb (*was beginning* for *began*) For ἦν has a complement of its own, *of thirty years ;* it therefore signifies here, *was of the age of*. Some have tried to make τριάκοντα ἐτῶν depend on ἀρχόμενος, He began *His thirtieth year ;* and it is perhaps owing to this interpretation that we find this participle placed first in the Alex. But for this sense, τριακοστοῦ ἔτους would have been necessary ; and the limitation *about* cannot have reference to the *commencement of the year*. (On the agreement of this chronological fact with the date, ver. 1, see p. 106). We have already observed that the age of thirty is that of the greatest physical and psychical strength, the ἀκμή of natural life. It was the age at which, among the Jews, the Levites entered upon their duties (Num. 4 : 3, 23), and when, among the Greeks, a young man began to take part in public affairs.† The participle ὤν, *being*, makes a strange impression, not only because it is purely and simply in juxtaposition with ἀρχόμενος (*beginning, being*), and depends on ἦν, the very verb of which it is a part, but still more because its connection with the latter verb cannot be explained by any of the three logical relations by which a participle is connected with a completed verb, *when, because*, or *although*. What relation of simultaneousness, causality, or opposition, could there be between the filiation of Jesus and the age at which He had arrived ? This incoherence is a clear indication that the evangelist has with some difficulty effected a soldering of two documents—that which he has hitherto followed, and which for the moment he abandons, and the genealogical register which he wishes to insert in this place.

With the participle ὤν, *being*, there begins then a transition which we owe to the pen of Luke. How far does it extend, and where does the genealogical register properly begin ? This is a nice and important question. We have only a hint for

* ℵ. B. L. X. some Mnn. It$^{\text{aliq}}$, Or. place αρχομενος before ωσει ετων τριακοντα, while T. R., with all the rest of the documents, place it after these words. ℵ. B. L. some Mnn. read in this order : ων υιος ως ενομιζετο Ιωσηφ, instead of ων ως ενομιζετο υιος Ιωσηφ in T. R. and the other authorities. H. Γ. (not B.) some Mnn. add του before Ιωσηφ.

† See the two passages from Xenophon ("Memor." 1) and from Dionysius of Halicarnassus ("Hist." iv. 6), cited by Wieseler, Beiträge, etc., pp. 165, 166.

its solution. This is the absence of the article τοῦ, *the*, before the name *Joseph*. This word is found before all the names belonging to the genealogical series. In the genealogy of Matthew, the article τόν is put in the same way before each proper name, which clearly proves that it was the ordinary form in vogue in this kind of document. The two MSS. H. and I. read, it is true, τοῦ before Ἰωσήφ But since these unimportant MSS. are unsupported by their ally the *Vatican*, to which formerly the same reading was erroneously attributed (see Tischend. 8th ed.), this various reading has no longer any weight. On the one hand, it is easily explained as an imitation of the following terms of the genealogy; on the other, we could not conceive of the suppression of the article in all the most ancient documents, if it had originally belonged to the text. This want of the article puts the name Joseph outside the genealogical series properly so called, and assigns to it a peculiar position. We must conclude from it—1*st*. That this name belongs rather to the sentence introduced by Luke; 2*d*. That the genealogical document which he consulted began with the name of Heli; 3*d*. And consequently, that this piece was not originally the genealogy of Jesus or of Joseph, but of Heli.

There is a second question to determine: whether we should prefer the Alexandrine reading, "being a son, as it was believed, of Joseph;" or the Byzantine text, "being, as it was believed, a son of Joseph." There is internal probability that the copyists would rather have been drawn to connect the words *son* and *Joseph*, in order to restore the phrase frequently employed in the Gospels, *son of Joseph*, than to separate them. This observation appears to decide for the Alexandrine text.

It is of importance next to determine the exact meaning of the τοῦ which precedes each of the genealogical names. Thus far we have supposed this word to be the article, and this is the natural interpretation. But we might give it the force of a pronoun, *he, the one*, and translate: "Joseph, *he* [the son] of Heli; Heli, *he* [the son] of Matthat," etc. Thus understood, the τοῦ would each time be in apposition with the preceding name, and would have the following name for its complement. But this explanation cannot be maintained; for—1*st*. It cannot be applied to the last term τοῦ Θεοῦ, in which τοῦ is evidently an article; 2*d*. The recurrence of τόν in the genealogy of Matthew proves that *the article* belonged to the terminology of these documents; 3*d*. The τοῦ thus understood would imply an intention to distinguish the individual to which it refers from some other person bearing the same name, but not having the same father, "Heli, *the one* of Matthat [and not one of another father];" which could not be the design of the genealogist. The τοῦ is therefore undoubtedly an article. But, admitting this, we may still hesitate between two interpretations; we may *subordinate* each genitive to the preceding name, as is ordinarily done: "Heli, son of Matthat, [which Matthat was a son] of Levi, [which Levi was a son] of . . .;" or, as Wieseler proposed, we may *co-ordinate* all the genitives, so as to make each of them depend directly on the word *son* placed at the head of the entire series: "Jesus, son of Heli; [Jesus, son] of Matthat . . ." So that, according to the Jewish usage, which permitted a grandson to be called the *son* of his *grandfather*, Jesus would be called the son of each of His ancestors in succession. This interpretation would not be, in itself, so forced as Bleek maintains. But nevertheless the former is preferable, for it alone really expresses the notion of a *succession of generations*, which is the ruling idea of every genealogy. The genitives in Luke merely supply the place of ἐγέννησε, as repeated in the original document, of which Matthew gives us the text. Besides, we do not think that it would be necessary to

supply, between each link in the genealogical chain, the term *viοῦ, son of*, as an apposition of the preceding name. Each genitive is also the complement of the name which precedes it. The idea of filiation resides in the grammatical *case*. We have the *genitive* here in its essence.

There remains, lastly, the still more important question: On what does the genitive τοῦ Ἡλί (*of Heli*) precisely depend? On the name Ἰωσήφ which immediately precedes it? This would be in conformity with the analogy of all the other genitives, which, as we have just proved, depend each on the preceding name. Thus Heli would have been the father of Joseph, and the genealogy of Luke, *as well as that of Matthew*, would be the genealogy of Jesus through Joseph. In that case we should have to explain how the two documents could be so totally different. But this view is incompatible with the absence of the article before *Joseph*. If the name Ἰωσήφ had been intended by Luke to be the basis of the entire genealogical series, it would have been fixed and determined by the article with much greater reason certainly than the names that follow. The genitive τοῦ Ἡλί, *of Heli*, depends therefore not on *Joseph*, but on the word *son*. This construction is not possible, it is true, with the received reading, in which the words *son* and *Joseph* form a single phrase, *son of Joseph*. The word *son* cannot be separated from the word it immediately governs: *Joseph*, to receive a second and more distant complement. With this reading, the only thing left to us is to make τοῦ Ἡλί depend on the participle ὤν: "Jesus . . . *being* . . . [born] of *Heli*" An antithesis might be found between the real fact (ὤν, *being*) and the apparent (ἐνομίζετο, *as was thought*): "being, as was thought, a son of Joseph, [in reality] born of Heli." But can the word ὤν signify both *to be* (in the sense of the verb substantive) and *to be born of?* Everything becomes much more simple if we assume the Alex. reading, which on other grounds has already appeared to us the more probable. The word *son*, separated as it is from its first complement, *of Joseph*, by the words *as was thought*, may very well have a second, *of Heli*. The first is only noticed in passing, and in order to be denied in the very mention of it: "Son, as was thought, of Joseph." The official information being thus disavowed, Luke, by means of the second complement, substitutes for it the truth, *of Heli;* and this name he distinguishes, by means of the article, as the first link of the genealogical chain properly so called. The text, therefore, to express the author's meaning clearly, should be written thus: "being a son—as was thought, of Joseph—of Heli, of Matthat . . ." Bleek has put the words ὡς ἐνομίζετο into a parenthesis, and rightly; only he should have added to them the word Ἰωσήφ.

This study of the text in detail leads us in this way to admit—1. That the genealogical register of Luke is that of Heli, the grandfather of Jesus; 2. That, this affiliation of Jesus by Heli being expressly opposed to His affiliation by Joseph, the document which he has preserved for us can be nothing else in his view than the genealogy of Jesus through Mary. But why does not Luke name Mary, and why pass immediately from Jesus to His grandfather? Ancient sentiment did not comport with the mention of the mother as the genealogical link. Among the Greeks a man was the son of his father, not of his mother; and among the Jews the adage was: "*Genus matris non vocatur genus*" ("Baba bathra," 110, *a*). In lieu of this, it is not uncommon to find in the O. T. the grandson called the son of his grandfather.*

* Comp. for example, 1 Chron. 8 : 3 with Gen. 46 : 21; Ezra 5 : 1, 6 : 14, with Zech. 1 : 1, 7; and in the N. T., Matt. 1 : 8 with 1 Chron. 4 : 11, 12—a passage in which King Joram is even recorded as having begotten the son of his grandson.

If there were any circumstances in which this usage was applicable, would not the wholly exceptional case with which Luke was dealing be such? There was only one way of filling up the hiatus, resulting from the absence of the father, between the grandfather and his grandson—namely, to introduce the name of the presumed father, noting at the same time the falseness of this opinion. It is remarkable that, in the Talmud, Mary the mother of Jesus is called *the daughter of Heli* ("Chagig." 77 : 4). From whence have Jewish scholars derived this information? If from the text of Luke, this proves that they understood it as we do; if they received it from tradition, it confirms the truth of the genealogical document Luke made use of.*

If this explanation be rejected, it must be admitted that Luke as well as Matthew gives us the genealogy of Joseph. The difficulties to be encountered in this direction are these: 1. The absence of τοῦ before the name Ἰωσηφ, and before this name alone, is not accounted for. 2. We are met by an all but insoluble contradiction between the two evangelists—the one indicating Heli as the father of Joseph, the other Jacob—which leads to two series of names wholly different. We might, it is true, have recourse to the following hypothesis proposed by Julius Africanus (third century):† Heli and Jacob were brothers; one of them died without children; the survivor, in conformity with the law, married his widow, and the first-born of this union, Joseph, was registered as a son of the deceased. In this way Joseph would have had two fathers—one real, the other legal. But this hypothesis is not sufficient; a second is needed. For if Heli and Jacob were brothers, they must have had the same father; and the two genealogies should coincide on reaching the name of the grandfather of Joseph, which is not the case. It is supposed, therefore, that they were brothers on the mother's side only, which explains both the difference of the fathers and that of the entire genealogies. This superstructure of coincidences is not absolutely inadmissible, but no one can think it natural. We should be reduced, then, to admit an absolute contradiction between the two evangelists. But can it be supposed that both or either of them could have been capable of fabricating such a register, heaping name upon name quite arbitrarily, and at the mere pleasure of their caprice? Who could credit a proceeding so absurd, and that in two genealogies, one of which sets out from Abraham, the venerated ancestor of the people, the other terminating in God Himself! All these names must have been taken from documents. But is it possible in this case to admit, in one or both of these writers, an entire mistake? 3. It is not only with Matthew that Luke would be in contradiction, but with himself. He admits the miraculous birth (chap. 1 and 2). It is conceivable that, from the theocratic point of view which Matthew takes, a certain interest might, even on this supposition, be assigned to the genealogy of Joseph, as the adoptive, legal father of the Messiah. But that Luke, to whom this official point of view was altogether foreign, should have handed down with so much care this series of seventy-three names, after having severed the chain at the first link, as he does by the remark, *as it was thought;* that, further, he should give himself the trouble, after this, to develop the entire series, and finish at last with God Himself; this is a moral impossibility. What sensible man, Gfrörer has very properly asked (with a different design, it is true), could take pleasure in drawing up such a list of ancestors, after having declared that the relationship is destitute of all reality? Modern criticism has, last of all, been driven to the following hypothesis: Matthew and Luke each found a genealogy of Jesus written from the Jewish-Christian standpoint: they were both different genealogies of Joseph; for among this party (which was no other than the primitive Church) he was without hesitation regarded as the father of Jesus. But at the time when these documents were published by the evangelists another theory already prevailed, that of the miraculous birth, which these two authors embraced. They published, therefore, their documents, adapting them as best they could to the

* The relationship of Jesus to the royal family is also affirmed by the Talmud ("Tr. Sanhedrim," 43).

† Eus. "Hist. Eccl." i. 7.

new belief, just as Luke does by his *as it was thought*, and Matthew by the periphrasis 1 : 16. But, 1. We have pointed out that the opinion which attributes to the primitive apostolic Church the idea of the natural birth of Jesus rests upon no solid foundation. 2. A writer who speaks of apostolic tradition as Luke speaks of it, 1 : 2, could not have knowingly put himself in opposition to it on a point of this importance. 3. If we advance no claim on behalf of the sacred writers to inspiration, we protest against whatever impeaches their good sense. The first evangelist, M. Reville maintains,* did not even perceive the incompatibility between the theory of the miraculous birth and his genealogical document. As to Luke, this same author says : "The third perceives very clearly the contradiction ; nevertheless he writes his history as if it did not exist." In other words, Matthew is more foolish than false, Luke more false than foolish. Criticism which is obliged to support itself by attributing to the sacred writers absurd methods, such as are found in no sensible writer, is self-condemned. There is not the smallest proof that the documents used by Matthew and Luke were of Jewish-Christian origin. On the contrary, it is very probable, since the facts all go to establish it, that they were simply copies of the official registers of the *public tables* (see below), referring, one to Joseph, the other to Heli, both consequently of Jewish origin. So far from there being any ground to regard them as monuments of a Christian conception, differing from that of the evangelists, it is these authors, or those who transmitted them to them, who set upon them for the first time the Christian seal, by adding to them the part which refers to Jesus. 4. Lastly, after all, these two series of completely different names have in any case to be explained. Are they fictitious ? Who can maintain this, when writers so evidently in earnest are concerned ? Are they founded upon documents ? How then could they differ so completely ? This difficulty becomes greater still if it is maintained that these two different genealogies of Joseph proceed from the same ecclesiastical quarter—from the Jewish-Christian party.

But have we sufficient proofs of the existence of genealogical registers among the Jews at this epoch ? We have already referred to the *public tables* (δέλτοι δημοσιαι) from which Josephus had extracted his own genealogy : "I relate my genealogy as I find it recorded in the public tables." † The same Josephus, in his work, "Contra Apion" (i. 7), says : "From all the countries in which our priests are scattered abroad, they send to Jerusalem (in order to have their children entered) documents containing the names of their parents and ancestors, and countersigned by witnesses." What was done for the priestly families could not fail to have been done with regard to the royal family, from which it was known that the Messiah was to spring. The same conclusion results also from the following facts. The famous Rabbi Hillel, who lived in the time of Jesus, succeeded in proving, by means of a genealogical table in existence at Jerusalem, that, although a poor man, he was a descendant of David.‡ The line of descent in the different branches of the royal family was so well known that even at the end of the first century of the Church the grandsons of Jude, the brother of the Lord, had to appear at Rome as descendants of David, and undergo examination in the presence of Domitian.§ According to these facts, the existence of two genealogical documents relating, one to Joseph, the other to Heli, and preserved in their respective families, offers absolutely nothing at all improbable.

In comparing the two narratives of the infancy, we have been led to assign them to two different sources : that of Matthew appeared to us to emanate from the relations of Joseph ; that of Luke from the circle of which Mary was the centre (p. 163). Something similar occurs again in regard to the two genealogies. That of Matthew, which has Joseph in view, must have proceeded from his family ; that which Luke has transmitted to us, being that of Mary's father, must have come from this latter quarter. But it is manifest that this difference of production is connected with a moral cause. The meaning of one of the genealogies is certainly hereditary, Messianic ; the meaning of the other is universal redemption. Hence, in the one, the relationship is through Joseph, the representative of the civil, national, theocratic side ; in the other,

* "Histoire du Dogme de la Divinité de Jésus Christ," p. 27.
† Jos. "Vita," c. i. ‡ "Bereschit rabba," 98.
§ Hegesippus, in Eusebius' "Hist. Eccl." iii. 19 and 20 (ed. Lœmmer).

the descent is through Mary, the organ of the real human relationship. Was not Jesus at once to appear and to be the son of David?—to appear such, through him whom the people regarded as His father; to be such, through her from whom He really derived His human existence? The two affiliations answered to these two requirements.

Second. Vers. 24–38.* And first, vers. 24–27: from Heli to the captivity. In this period Luke mentions 21 generations (up to Neri); only 19, if the various reading of Africanus be admitted; Matthew, 14. This last number is evidently too small for the length of the period. As Matthew omits in the period of the kings four well-known names of the O. T., it is probable that he takes the same course here, either through an involuntary omission, or for the sake of keeping to the number 14 (1 : 17). This comparison should make us appreciate the exactness of Luke's register. But how is it that the names Zorobabel and Salathiel occur, connected with each other in the same way, in both the genealogies? And how can Salathiel have Neri for his father in Luke, and in Matthew King Jechonias? Should these names be regarded as standing for different persons, as Wieseler thinks? This is not impossible. The Zorobabel and the Salathiel of Luke might be two unknown persons of the obscurer branch of the royal family descended from Nathan; the Zorobabel and the Salathiel of Matthew, the two well-known persons of the O. T. history, belonging to the reigning branch, the first a son, the second a grandson of King Jechonias (1 Chron. 3 : 17); Ezra 3 : 2; Hag. 1 : 1). This is the view which, after all, appears to Bleek most probable. It is open, however, to a serious objection from the fact that these two names, in the two lists, refer so exactly to the same period, since in both of them they are very nearly half way between Jesus and David. If the identity of these persons in the two genealogies is admitted, the explanation must be found in 2 Kings 24 : 12, which proves that King Jechonias had no son at the time when he was carried into captivity. It is scarcely probable that he had one while in prison, where he remained shut up for thirty-eight years. He or they whom the passage 1 Chron. 3 : 17 assigns to him (which, besides, may be translated in three different ways) must be regarded as adopted sons or as sons-in-law; they would be spoken of as sons, because they would be unwilling to allow the reigning branch of the royal family to become extinct. Salathiel, the first of them, would thus have some other father than Jechonias; and this father would be Neri, of the Nathan branch, indicated by Luke. An alternative hypothesis has been proposed, founded on the Levirate law. Neri, as a relative of Jechonias, might have married one of the wives of the imprisoned king, in order to perpetuate the royal family; and the son of this union, Salathiel, would have been legally a son of Jechonias, but really a son of Neri. In any case, the numerous differences that are found in the statements of our historical books at this period prove that the catastrophe of the captivity brought considerable confusion into the registers or family traditions.† Rhesa and Abiud, put down, the one by Luke, the other

* We omit the numerous orthographical variations connected with these proper names. Ver. 24. Jul. Afric. Eus. Ir. (probably) omit the two names Μαθθαθ and Λευει.

† According to 1 Chron. 3 : 16, 2 Chron. 36 : 10 (Heb. text), Zedekiah was son of Jehoiakim and brother of Jehoiachin; but, according to 2 Kings 24 : 17 and Jer. 37 : 1, he was son of Josiah and brother of Jehoiakim. According to 1 Chron. 3 : 19, Zorobabel was son of Pedaiah and grandson of Jeconiah, and consequently nephew of Salathiel; while, according to Ezra 3 : 2, Neh. 12 1, Hag. 1 : 1, he was son of Salathiel, etc.

by Matthew, as sons of Zorobabel, are not mentioned in the O. T., according to which the sons of this restorer of Israel should have been Meshullam and Hananiah (1 Chron. 3 : 19). Bleek observes, that if the evangelists had fabricated their lists, they would naturally have made use of these two names that are furnished by the sacred text ; therefore they have followed their documents.

Vers. 28–31. From the captivity to David, 20 names. Matthew for the same period has only 14. But it is proved by the O. T. that he omits four ; the number 20, in Luke, is a fresh proof of the accuracy of his document. On Nathan, son of David, comp. 2 Sam. 5 : 14, Zech. 12 : 12. The passage in Zechariah proves that this branch was still flourishing after the return from the captivity. If Neri, the descendant of Nathan, was the real father of Salathiel, the adopted son or son-in-law of Jechonias, we should find here once more the characteristic of the two genealogies : in Matthew, the legal, official point of view ; in Luke, the real, human point of view.

Vers. 32–34*a*. From David to Abraham. The two genealogies agree with each other, and with the O. T.

Vers. 34*b*–38. From Abraham to Adam. This part is peculiar to Luke. It is compiled evidently from the O. T., and according to the text of the LXX., with which it exactly coincides. The name Cainan, ver. 36, is only found in the LXX., and is wanting in the Heb. text (Gen. 10 : 24, 11 12). This must be a very ancient variation. The words, *of God*, with which it ends, are intended to inform us that it is not through ignorance that the genealogist stops at Adam, but because he has reached the end of the chain, perhaps also to remind us of the truth expressed by Paul at Athens : "We are the offspring of God." The last word of the genealogy is connected with its starting-point (vers. 22, 23). If man were not the offspring of God, the incarnation (ver. 22) would be impossible. God cannot say to a man, "Thou art my beloved son," save on this ground, that humanity itself is His issue (ver. 38).*

FOURTH NARRATIVE.—CHAP. 4 : 1–13.

The Temptation.

Every free creature, endowed with various faculties, must pass through a conflict, in which it decides either to use them for its own gratification, or to glorify God by devoting them to His service. The angels have passed through this trial ; the first man underwent it ; Jesus, being truly human, did not escape it. Our Syn. are unanimous upon this point. Their testimony as to the time when this conflict took place is no less accordant. All three place it immediately after His baptism, at the outset of His Messianic career. This date is important for determining the true meaning of this trial.

The temptation of the first man bore upon the use of the powers inherent in our nature. Jesus also experienced this kind of trial. How many times during His childhood and early manhood must He have been exposed to those temptations which address themselves to the instincts of the natural life ! The lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life—these different forms of sin, separately or with united force, endeavored to besiege His heart, subjugate His will, enslave His powers, and invade this pure being as they had invaded the innocent Adam. But on the bat-

* See the valuable applications which Riggenbach makes of these genealogies, "Vie de Jésus," ninth lesson, at the commencement.

tle-field on which Adam had succumbed Jesus remained a victor. The "conscience without a scar," which He carried from the first part of His life into the second, assures us of this. The new trial He is now to undergo belongs to a higher domain —that of the spiritual life. It no longer respects the powers of the natural man, but His filial position, and the supernatural powers just conferred upon Him at His baptism. The powers of the Spirit are in themselves holy, but the history of the church of Corinth shows how they may be profaned when used in the service of egotism and self-love (1 Cor. 12–14). This is that filthiness of the spirit (2 Cor. 7 : 1), which is more subtle, and often more pernicious, than that of the flesh. The divine powers which Jesus had just received had therefore to be sanctified in His experience, that is, to receive from Him, in His inmost soul, their consecration to the service of God. In order to this, it was necessary that an opportunity to apply them either to His own use or to God's service should be offered Him. His decision on this critical occasion would determine forever the tendency and nature of His Messianic work. Christ or Antichrist was the alternative term of the two ways which were opening before Him. This trial is not therefore a repetition of that of Adam, the father of the old humanity; it is the special trial of the Head of the new humanity. And it is not simply a question here, as in our conflicts, whether a given individual shall form part of the kingdom of God, it is the very existence of this kingdom that is at stake. Its future sovereign, sent to found it, struggles in close combat with the sovereign of the hostile realm.

This narrative comprises: 1*st.* A general view (vers. 1, 2); 2*d.* The first temptation (vers. 3, 4); 3*d.* The second (vers. 5–8); 4*th.* The third (vers. 9–12); 5*th.* An historical conclusion (ver. 13).

First. Vers. 1, 2.* By these words, *full of the Holy Ghost*, this narrative is brought into close connection with that of the baptism. The genealogy is therefore intercalated. While the other baptized persons, after the ceremony, went away to their own homes, Jesus betook Himself into solitude. This He did not at His own prompting, as Luke gives us to understand, by the expression *full of the Holy Ghost*, which proves that the Spirit directed Him in this, as in every other step. The two other evangelists explicitly say it. Matthew, *He was led up of the Spirit;* Mark, still more forcibly, *Immediately the Spirit driveth Him into the wilderness.* Perhaps the human inclination of Jesus would have been to return to Galilee and begin at once to teach. The Spirit detains Him; and Matthew, who, in accordance with his didactic aim, in narrating the fact explains its object, says expressly: "He was led up of the Spirit . . . to be tempted." The complement of the verb *returned* would be: *from the Jordan* (ἀπό) *into Galilee* (εἰς). But this complex government is so distributed that the first part is found in ver. 1 (the ἀπό without the εἰς, and the second in ver. 14 (the εἰς without the ἀπό). The explanation of this construction is, that the temptation was an interruption in the return of Jesus from the Jordan into Galilee. The Spirit detained Him in Judæa. The T. R. reads εἰς, "led into the wilderness;" the Alex. ἐν, "led (carried hither and thither) in the wilderness." We might suppose that this second reading was only the result of the very natural reflection that, John being already in the desert, Jesus had not to repair thither. But, on the other hand, the received reading may easily have been imported into Luke

* Ver. 1. ℵ B. D. L. It$^{aliq.}$, ει τη ερημα instead of εις την ερημον, the reading of T. R. with 15 Mjj., all the Mnn. Syr. It$^{aliq.}$ Vg. Ver. 2. The same omit υστερον (taken from Matthew.)

from the two other Syn. And the prep. of rest (ἐν) in the Alex. better accords with the imperf. ἤγετο, *was led,* which denotes a continuous action. The expression, *was led by,* indicates that the severe exercises of soul which Jesus experienced under the action of the Spirit absorbed Him in such a way that the use of His faculties in regard to the external world was thereby suspended. In going into the desert He was not impelled by a desire to accomplish any definite object ; it was only, as it were, a cover for the state of intense meditation in which He was absorbed. Lost in contemplation of His personal relation to God, the full consciousness of which He had just attained, and of the consequent task it imposed upon Him in reference to Israel and the world, His heart sought to make these recent revelations wholly its own. If tradition is to be credited, the wilderness here spoken of was the mountainous and uninhabited country bordering on the road which ascends from Jericho to Jerusalem. On the right of this road, not far from Jericho, there rises a limestone peak, exceedingly sharp and abrupt, which bears the name of Quarantania. The rocks which surround it are pierced by a number of caves. This would be the scene of the temptation. We are ignorant whether this tradition rests upon any historical fact. This locality is a continuation of the desert of Judæa, where John abode.

The words *forty days* may refer either to *was led* or to *being tempted ;* in sense both come to the same thing, the two actions being simultaneous. According to Luke and Mark, Jesus was incessantly besieged during this whole time. Suggestions of a very different nature from the holy thoughts which usually occupied Him harassed the working of His mind. Matthew does not mention this secret action of the enemy, who was preparing for the final crisis. How can it be maintained that one of these forms of the narrative has been borrowed from the other?

The term *devil,* employed by Luke and Matthew, comes from διαβάλλειν, *to spread reports, to slander.* Mark employs the word Satan (from שׂטן, to oppose ; Zech. 3 : 1, 2 ; Job 1 : 6, etc.). The first of these names is taken from the relation of this being to men ; the second from his relations with God.

The possibility of the existence of moral beings of a different nature from that of man cannot be denied *à priori.* Now if these beings are free creatures, subject to a law of probation, as little can it be denied that this probation might issue in a fall. Lastly, since in every society of moral beings there are eminent individuals who, by virtue of their ascendency, become centres around which a host of inferior individuals group themselves, this may also be the case in this unknown spiritual domain. Keim himself says : " We regard this question of the existence of an evil power as altogether an open question for science." This question, which is an open one from a scientific point of view, is settled in the view of faith by the testimony of the Saviour, who, in a passage in which there is not the slightest trace of accommodation to popular prejudice, John 8 : 44, delineates in a few graphic touches the moral position of Satan. In another passage, Luke 22 : 31, " Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat ; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not," Jesus lifts the veil which hides from us the scenes of the invisible world ; the relation which He maintains between the accuser Satan, and Himself the intercessor, implies that in His eyes this personage is no less a personal being than Himself. The part sustained by this being in the temptation of Jesus is attested by the passage, Luke 11 : 21, 22. It was necessary that the strong man, Satan, the prince of this world, should be vanquished by his adversary, the stronger than he, in a personal conflict, for the latter to be able to set about spoiling the world, which is Satan's stronghold. Weizsäcker and Keim * acknowledge an allusion in this passage to the fact of the temptation. It is this victory in single combat which makes the deliverance of every captive of Satan possible to Jesus.

* " Untersuch " p. 330 ; " Gesch. Jesu," t. i. p. 570.

Luke mentions Jesus' abstinence from food for six weeks as a fact which was only the natural consequence of His being absorbed in profound meditation. To Him, indeed, this whole time passed like a single hour; He did not even feel the pangs of hunger. This follows from the words: "And when they were ended, He afterward hungered" By the term *νηστεύσας, having fasted*, Matthew appears to give this abstinence the character of a deliberate ritual act, to make it such a fast as, among the Jews, ordinarily accompanied certain seasons devoted specially to prayer. This shade of thought is not a contradiction, but accords with the general character of the two narrations, and becomes a significant indication of their originality. The fasts of Moses and Elijah, in similar circumstances, lasted the same time. In certain morbid conditions, which involve a more or less entire abstinence from food, a period of six weeks generally brings about a crisis, after which the demand for nourishment is renewed with extreme urgency. The exhausted body becomes a prey to a deathly sinking. Such, doubtless, was the condition of Jesus; He felt Himself dying. It was the moment the tempter had waited for to make his decisive assault.

Second. Vers. 3, 4.* First Temptation.—The text of Luke is very sober: *The devil said to Him.* The encounter exhibited under this form may be explained as a contact of mind with mind; but in Matthew the expression *came to Him* seems to imply a bodily appearance. This, however, is not necessarily its meaning. This term may be regarded as a symbolical expression of the moral sensation experienced by Jesus at the moment when He felt the attack of this spirit so alien from His own. In this sense, the coming took place only in the spiritual sphere. Since Scripture does not mention any visible appearance of Satan, and as the angelophanies are facts the perception of which always implies a co-operation of the inner sense, the latter interpretation is more natural. The words, *if thou art*, express something very different from a doubt; this *if* has almost the force of *since*: "If thou art really, as it seems . . ." Satan alludes to God's salutation at the baptism. M. de Pressensé is wrong in paraphrasing the words: "If thou art the Messiah." Here, and invariably, the name *Son of God* refers to a personal relation, not to an office (see on ver. 22). But what criminality would there have been in the act suggested to Jesus? It has been said that He was not allowed to use His miraculous power for His own benefit. Why not, if He was allowed to use it for the benefit of others? The moral law does not command that one should love his neighbor better than himself. It has been said that He would have acted from His own will, God not having commanded this miracle. But did God direct every act of Jesus by means of a positive command? Had not divine direction in Jesus a more spiritual character? Satan's address and the answer of Jesus put us on the right track. In saying to Him, *If thou art the Son of God*, Satan seeks to arouse in His heart the feeling of His divine greatness; and with what object? He wishes by this means to make Him feel more painfully the contrast between His actual destitution, consequent on His human condition, and the abundance to which His divine nature seems to give Him a right. There was indeed, especially after His baptism, an anomaly in the position of Jesus. On the one hand, He had been exalted to a distinct consciousness of His dignity as the Son of God; while, on the other, His condition as Son of man remained the same. He continued this mode of existence wholly similar to ours, and wholly

* Ver. 4. ℵ. B. L. omit *λεγων*. 9 Mjj. 70 Mnn. Or. omit *ο* before *ανθρωπος*. ℵ. B. L. Cop. omit the words, *αλλ' επι παντι ρηματι Θεου*, which is the reading of T R. with 15 Mjj., all the Mnn. Syr. It. Vg. (taken from Matthew).

dependent, in which form it was His mission to realize here below the filial life. Thence there necessarily resulted a constant temptation to elevate, by acts of power, His miserable condition to the height of His conscious Sonship. And this is the first point of attack by which Satan seeks to master His will, taking advantage for this purpose of the utter exhaustion in which he sees Him sinking. Had Jesus yielded to this suggestion, He would have violated the conditions of that earthly existence to which, out of love to us, He had submitted, denied His title as Son of man, in order to realize before the time His condition as Son of God, retracted in some sort the act of His incarnation, and entered upon that false path which was afterward formulated by docetism in a total or partial denial of Christ come in the flesh. Such a course would have made His humanity a mere appearance.

This is precisely what is expressed in His answer. The word of holy writ, Deut. 8 : 3, in which He clothes His thought, is admirably adapted, both in form and substance, to this purpose : *man shall not live by bread alone.* This term, *man,* recalls to Satan the form of existence which Jesus has accepted, and from which He cannot depart on His own responsibility. The omission of the article ὁ before ἄνθρωπος in nine Mjj. gives this word a generic sense which suits the context. But Jesus, while thus asserting His entire acceptance of human nature, reminds Satan that man, though he be but man, is not left without divine succor. The experience of Israel in the wilderness, to which Moses' words refer, proves that the action of divine power is not limited to the ordinary nourishment of bread. God can support human existence by other material means, such as manna and quails ; He can even, if He pleases, make a man live by the mere power of His will. This principle is only the application of a living monotheism to the sphere of physical life. By proclaiming it in this particular instance, Jesus declares that, in His career, no physical necessity shall ever compel Him to deny, in the name of His exalted Sonship, the humble mode of existence He adopted in making Himself man, until it shall please God Himself to transform His condition by rendering it suitable to His essence as Son of God. Although Son, He will nevertheless remain subject, subject unto the weakness even of death (Heb. 5 : 8). The words, *but by every word of God,* are omitted by the Alex. ; they are probably taken from Matthew. What reason could there have been for omitting them from the text of Luke? By their suppression, the answer of Jesus assumes that brief and categorical character which agrees with the situation. The sending of the angels to minister to Jesus, which Matthew and Mark mention at the close of their narrative, proves that the expectation of Jesus was not disappointed ; God sustained Him, as He had sustained Elijah in the desert in similar circumstances (1 Kings 19).

The first temptation refers to the person of Jesus ; the second, to His work.

Third. Vers. 5–8.* Second Temptation.—The occasion of this fresh trial is not a physical sensation ; it is an aspiration of the soul. Man, created in the image of God, aspires to reign. This instinct, the direction of which is perverted by selfishness, is none the less legitimate in its origin. It received in Israel, through the divine promises, a definite aim—the supremacy of the elect people over all others ; and

* Ver. 5. ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn. omit ὁ διαβολος· ℵ. B. L. It$^{aliq.}$ omit εις προς ὑψηλον, which is the reading of T. R. with 14 Mjj. the Mnn. Syr. It$^{aliq.}$ Ver. 7. All the Mjj. read πασα instead of παντα, the reading of T. R. with only some Mnn. Ver. 8. B. D. L. Z. several Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique}, Vg. omit the words υπαγε οπισω μου Σατανα. Γαρ, in the T. R., has in its favor only U. Wb. Δ. Λ.

a very precise form—the Messianic hope. The patriotism of Jesus was kindled at this fire (13 : 34, 19 : 41); and He must have known, from what He had heard from the mouth of God at His baptism, that it was He who was destined to realize this magnificent expectation. It is this prospect, open before the gaze of Jesus, of which Satan avails himself in trying to fascinate and seduce Him into a false way. The words *the devil*, and *into an high mountain*, ver. 5, are omitted by the Alex. It might be supposed that this omission arises from the confusion of the two syllables *ον* which terminate the words *αὐτόν* and *ὑψηλόν*. But is it not easier to believe there has been an interpolation from Matthew? In this case, the complement understood to *taking Him up*, in Luke, might doubtless be, as in Matthew, a mountain. Still, where no complement is expressed, it is more natural to explain it as "taking Him into the air." It is not impossible that this difference between the two evangelists is connected with the different order in which they arrange the two last temptations. In Luke, Satan, after having taken Jesus up into the air, set Him down on a pinnacle of the temple. This order is natural. We are asked how Jesus could be given over in this way to the disposal of Satan. Our reply is: Since the Spirit led Him into the wilderness in order that He might be tempted, it is not surprising that He should be given up for a time, body and soul, to the power of the tempter. It is not said that Jesus really saw all the kingdoms of the earth, which would be absurd; but that Satan showed them to Him. This term may very well signify that he made them appear before the view of Jesus, in instantaneous succession, by a diabolical phantasmagoria. He had seen so many great men succumb to a similar mirage, that he might well hope to prevail again by this means. The Jewish idea of Satan's rule over this visible world, expressed in the words which two of the evangelists put into his mouth, may not be so destitute of foundation as many think. Has not Jesus indorsed it, by calling this mysterious being *the prince of this world?* Might not Satan, as an archangel, have had assigned to him originally as his domain the earth and the system to which it belongs? In this case, he uttered no falsehood when he said, All this power has been delivered unto me (ver. 6). The truth of this assertion appears further from this very expression, in which he does homage to the sovereignty of God, and acknowledges himself His vassal. Neither is it necessary to see imposture in the words: *And to whomsoever I will, I give it.* God certainly leaves to Satan a certain use of His sovereignty and powers; he reigns over the whole extra-divine sphere of human life, and has power to raise to the pinnacle of glory the man whom he favors. The majesty of such language was doubtless sustained by splendor of appearance on the part of him who used it; and if ever Satan put on his form of an angel of light (2 Cor. 11 : 14), it was at this moment which decided his empire. The condition which he attaches to the surrender of his power into the hands of Jesus, ver. 7, has often been presented as a snare far too coarse for it ever to have been laid by such a crafty spirit. Would not, indeed, the lowest of the Israelites have rejected such a proposal with horror? But there is a little word in the text to be taken into consideration—*οὖν*, *therefore*—which puts this condition in logical connection with the preceding words. It is not as an individual, it is as the representative of divine authority on this earth, that Satan here claims the homage of Jesus. The act of prostration, in the East, is practised toward every lawful superior, not in virtue of his personal character, but out of regard to the portion of divine power of which he is the depositary. For behind every power is ever seen the power of God, from whom it emanates. As man, Jesus formed part of the domain intrusted to Satan.

As called to succeed him, it seemed He could only do it, in so far as Satan himself should transfer to Him the investiture of his office. The words, *if thou wilt worship me*, are not therefore an appeal to the ambition of Jesus ; they express the condition *sine quâ non* laid down by the ancient Master of the world to the installation of Jesus in the Messianic sovereignty. In speaking thus, Satan deceived himself only in one point; this was, that the kingdom which was about to commence was in any respect a continuation of his own, or depended on a transmission of power from him. It would have been very different, doubtless, had Jesus proposed to realize such a conception of the Messianic kingdom as found expression in the popular prejudice of His age. The Israelitish monarchy, thus understood, would really have been only a new and transient form of the kingdom of Satan on this earth—a kingdom of external force, a kingdom of this world. But what Jesus afterward expressed in these words, "I am a King ; to this end was I born, but my kingdom is not of this world" (John 18 : 37, 36), was already in His heart. His kingdom was the beginning of a rule of an entirely new nature ; or, if this kingdom had an antecedent, it was that established by God in Zion (Ps. 2). Jesus had just at this very time been invested with this at the hands of the divine delegate, John the Baptist. Therefore He had nothing to ask from Satan, and consequently no homage to pay him. This refusal was a serious matter. Jesus thereby renounced all power founded upon material means and social institutions. He broke with the Messianic Jewish ideal under the received form. He confined Himself, in accomplishing the conquest of the world, to spiritual action exerted upon souls ; He condemned Himself to gain them one by one, by the labor of conversion and sanctification—a gentle, unostentatious progress, contemptible in the eyes of the flesh, of which the end, the visible reign, was only to appear after the lapse of centuries. Further, such an answer was a declaration of war against Satan, and on the most unfavorable conditions. Jesus condemned Himself to struggle, unaided by human power, with an adversary having at his disposal all human powers ; to march with ten thousand men against a king who was coming against Him with twenty thousand (14 : 31). Death inevitably awaited Him in this path. But He unhesitatingly accepted all this, that He might remain faithful to God, from whom alone He determined to receive everything. To render homage to a being who had broken with God, would be to honor him in his guilty usurpation, to associate Himself with his rebellion. This time again Jesus conveys His refusal in a passage of holy writ, Deut. 6 : 13 ; He thereby removes every appearance of answering him on mere human authority. The Hebrew text and the LXX. merely say : "Thou shalt fear the Lord, and thou shalt serve Him." But it is obvious that this word *serve* includes adoration, and therefore the act of προσκυνειν, *falling down in worship*, by which it is expressed. The words, *Get thee behind me, Satan*, in Luke, are taken from Matthew ; so is the *for* in the next sentence. But in thus determining to establish His kingdom without any aid from material force, was not Jesus relying so much the more on a free use of the supernatural powers with which He had just been endowed, in order to overcome, by great miraculous efforts, the obstacles and dangers to be encountered in the path He had chosen? This is the point on which Satan puts Jesus to a last proof. The third temptation then refers to the use which He intends to make of divine power in the course of His Messianic career.

Fourth. Vers. 9–12.* Third Temptation.—This trial belongs to a higher sphere

* Ver. 9. The *o* before *υιος* in the T. R. is omitted in all the Mjj. and in 150 Mnn.

than that of physical or political life. It is of a purely religious character, and touches the deepest and most sacred relations of Jesus with His Father. The dignity of a son of God, with a view to which man was created, carries with it the free disposal of divine power, and of the motive forces of the universe. Does not God Himself say to His child: "Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine"? (15 : 31). But in proportion as man is raised to this filial position, and gradually reaches divine fellowship, there arises out of this state an ever-increasing danger—that of abusing his great privilege, by changing, as an indiscreet inferior is tempted to do, this fellowship into familiarity. From this giddy height to which the grace of God has raised him, man falls, therefore, in an instant into the deepest abyss—into a presumptuous use of God's gifts and abuse of His confidence. This pride is more unpardonable than that called in Scripture the pride of life. The abuse of God's help is a more serious offence than not waiting for it in faith (first temptation), or than regarding it as insufficient (second temptation). The higher sphere to which this trial belongs is indicated by the scene of it—the most sacred place, Jerusalem (*the holy city*, as Matthew says) and the temple. The term πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ, translated *pinnacle of the temple*, might denote the anterior extremity of the line of meeting of two inclined planes, forming the roof of the sacred edifice. But in this case, ναοῦ would have been required rather than ἱεροῦ (see 1 : 9). Probably, therefore, it is some part of the court that is meant—either Solomon's Porch, which was situated on the eastern side of the temple platform, and commanded the gorge of the Kedron, or the Royal Porch, built on the south side of this platform, and from which, as Josephus says, the eye looked down into an abyss. The word πτερύγιον would denote the coping of this peristyle. Such a position is a type of the sublime height to which Satan sees Jesus raised, and whence he would have Him cast Himself down into an abyss.

The idea of this incomparable spiritual elevation is expressed by these words: *If thou art a Son of God.* The Alex. rightly omit the art. before the word *Son*. For it is a question here of the filial character, and not of the personality of the Son. "If thou art a being to whom it appertains to call God thy Father in a unique sense, do not fear to do a daring deed, and give God an opportunity to show the particular care He takes of thee." And as Satan had observed that Jesus had twice replied to him by the word of God, he tries in his turn to avail himself of this weapon. He applies here the promise (Ps. 91 : 11, 12) by an *à fortiori* argument: "If God has promised thus to keep the righteous, how much more His well-beloved Son!" The quotation agrees with the text of the LXX., with the exception of its omitting the words *in all thy ways*, which Matthew also omits; the latter omits, besides, the preceding words, *to keep thee*. It has been thought that this omission was made by Satan himself, who would suppress these words with a view to make the application of the passage more plausible, unduly generalizing the promise of the Psalm, which, according to the context, applies to the righteous only in so far as he walks in the ways of obedience. This is very subtle. What was the real bearing of this temptation? With God, power is always employed in the service of goodness, of love; this is the difference between God and Satan, between divine miracle and diabolical sorcery. Now the devil in this instance aims at nothing less than making Jesus pass from one of these spheres to the other, and this in the name of that most sacred and tender element in the relationship between two beings that love each other—confidence. If Jesus succumbs to the temptation by calling on the Almighty to deliver

Him from a peril into which He has not been thrown in the service of goodness. He puts God in the position of either refusing His aid, and so separating His cause from His own—a divorce between the Father and the Son—or of setting free the exercise of His omnipotence, at least for a moment, from the control of holiness—a violation of His own nature. Either way, it would be all over with Jesus, and even, if we dare so speak, with God.

Jesus characterizes the impious nature of this suggestion as *tempting God*, ver. 12. This term signifies putting God to the alternative either of acting in a way opposed to His plans or His nature, or of compromising the existence or safety of a person closely allied to Him. It is confidence carried to such presumption, as to become treason against the divine majesty. It has sometimes been thought that Satan wanted to induce Jesus to establish His kingdom by some miraculous demonstration, by some prodigy of personal display, which, accomplished in the view of a multitude of worshippers assembled in the temple, would have drawn to Him the homage of all Israel. But the narrative makes no allusion to any effect to be produced by this miracle. It is a question here of a whim rather than of a calculation, of divine force placed at the service of caprice rather than of a deliberate evil purpose. For the third time Jesus borrows the form of His reply from Scripture, and, which is remarkable, again from Deuteronomy (6 : 16). This book, which recorded the experience of Israel during the forty years' sojourn in the desert, had perhaps been the special subject of Jesus' meditations during His own sojourn in the wilderness. The plural, *ye shall not tempt*, in the O. T. is changed by Jesus into the singular, *thou shalt not tempt*. Did this change proceed from a double meaning which Jesus designedly introduced into this passage? While applying it to Himself in His relation to God, He seems, in fact, to apply it at the same time to Satan in relation to Himself ; as if He meant to say : Desist, therefore, now from tempting me, thy God.

Almost all interpreters at the present day disapprove the order followed by Luke, and prefer Matthew's, who makes this last temptation the second. It seems to me, that if the explanation we have just given is just, there can be no doubt that Luke's order is preferable. The man who is no longer man, the Christ who is no longer Christ, the Son who is no longer Son—such are the three degrees of the temptation.* The second might appear the most exalted and dangerous to men who had grown up in the midst of the theocracy ; and it is intelligible that the tradition found in the Jewish-Christian churches, the type of which has been preserved in the first Gospel, should have made this peculiarly Messianic temptation (the second in Luke) the crowning effort of the conflict. But in reality it was not so ; the true order historically, in a moral conflict, must be that which answers to the moral essence of things.

Fifth. Ver. 13. Historical Conclusion.—The expression *πάντα πειρασμόν* does not signify all the temptation (this would require *ὅλον*), but every kind of temptation. We have seen that the temptations mentioned refer, one to the person of Jesus, another to the nature of His work, the third to His use of the divine aid accorded to Him for this work ; they are therefore very varied. Further, connected as they are, they form a complete cycle ; and this is expressed in the term *συντελέσας*, *having finished*, *fulfilled*. Nevertheless Luke announces, in the conclusion of his narrative,

* [M. Godet is not as perspicuous here as usual. The original is : " L'homme qui n'est plus homme, le Christ qui n'est plus Christ, le Fils qui n'est plus Fils, voila . . . "]

the future return of Satan to subject Jesus to a fresh trial. If the words ἄχρι καιροῦ signified, as they are often translated, *for a season*, we might think that this future temptation denotes in general the trials to which Jesus would be exposed during the course of His ministry. But these words signify, *until a favorable time*. Satan expects, therefore, some new opportunity, just such a special occasion as the previous one. This conflict, foretold so precisely, can be none other than that of Gethsemane. "This is the hour and power of darkness," said Jesus at that very time (22 : 53); and a few moments before, according to John (14 : 30), He had said: "The prince of this world cometh." Satan then found a new means of acting on the soul of Jesus, through the fear of suffering. Just as in the desert he thought he could dazzle this heart, that had had no experience of life, with the *éclat* of success and the intoxication of delight; so in Gethsemane he tried to make it swerve by the nightmare of punishment and the anguish of grief. These, indeed, are the two levers by which he succeeds in throwing men out of the path of obedience.

Luke omits here the fact mentioned by Matthew and Mark, of the approach of angels to minister to Jesus. It is no dogmatic repugnance which makes him omit it, for he mentions an instance wholly similar, 22 : 43. Therefore he was ignorant of it; and consequently he was not acquainted with the two other narratives.

THE TEMPTATION.

We shall examine—1*st*. The nature of this fact; 2*d*. Its object; 3*d*. The three narratives.

1*st*. *Nature of the Temptation.*—The ancients generally understood this account *literally*. They believed that the devil appeared to Jesus in a bodily form, and actually carried Him away to the mountain and to the pinnacle of the temple. But, to say nothing of the impossibility of finding anywhere a mountain from which all the kingdoms of the world could be seen, the Bible does not mention a single visible appearance of Satan; and in the conflict of Gethsemane, which, according to Luke, is a renewal of this, the presence of the enemy is not projected into the world of sense. Have we to do then here, as some moderns have thought, with a *human* tempter designated metaphorically by the name Satan, in the sense in which Jesus addressed Peter, "Get thee behind me, Satan," with an envoy from the Sanhedrim, *ex gr.*, who had come to test Him (Kuinoel), or with the deputation from the same body mentioned in John 1 : 19, *et seq.*, who, on their return from their interview with the forerunner, met Jesus in the desert, and there besought His Messianic co-operation, by offering Him the aid of the Jewish authorities (Lange)? But it was not until after Jesus had already left the desert and rejoined John on the banks of the Jordan, that He was publicly pointed out by the latter as the Messiah.* Up to this time no one knew Him as such. Besides, if this hypothesis affords a sufficient explanation of the second temptation (in the order of Luke), it will not explain either the first or the third.

Was this narrative, then, originally nothing more than a moral lesson conveyed in the form of a *parable*, in which Jesus inculcated on His disciples some most important maxims for their future ministry? Never to use their miraculous power for their personal advantage, never to associate with wicked men for the attainment of good ends, never to perform a miracle in an ostentatious spirit—these were the precepts which Jesus had enjoined upon them in a figurative manner, but which they took literally (Schleiermacher, Schweizer, Bleek). But first, of all, is it conceivable that Jesus should have expressed Himself so awkwardly as to lead to such a mistake? Next, how could He have spoken to the apostles of an external empire to be founded by them? Further, the Messianic aspect, so conspicuous in the second temptation, is completely disguised in that one of the three maxims which, according to the ex-

* See my "Commentary on the Gospel of John," on 1 : 29.

planation of these theologians, ought to correspond with it. Baumgarten-Crusius, in order to meet this last objection, applies the three maxims, not to that from which the apostles were to abstain, but to that which they must not expect from Jesus Himself: "As Messiah, Jesus meant to say, I shall not seek to satisfy your sensual appetities, your ambitious aspirations, nor your thirst for miracles." But all this kind of interpretation meets with an insurmountable obstacle in Mark's narrative, where mention is made merely of the sojourn in the desert, and of the temptation in general, without the three particular tests, that is, according to this opinion, without the really significant portion of the information being even mentioned. According to this, Mark would have lost the kernel and retained only the shell, or, as Keim says, "kept the flesh while rejecting the skeleton." In transforming the parable into history, the evangelist would have omitted precisely that which contained the idea of the parable. Usteri, who had at one time adopted the preceding view, was led by these difficulties to regard this narrative as a myth emanating from the Christian consciousness; and Strauss tried to explain the origin of this legend by the Messianic notions current among the Jews. But the latter has not succeeded in producing, from the Jewish theology, a single passage earlier than the time of Jesus in which the idea of a personal conflict between the Messiah and Satan is expressed. As to the Christian consciousness, would it have been capable of creating complete in all its parts a narrative so mysterious and profound? Lastly, the remarkably fixed place which this event occupies in the three synoptics between the baptism of Jesus and the commencement of His ministry proves that this element of the evangelical history belongs to the earliest form of Christian instruction. It could not therefore be the product of a later legendary creation.

Unless all these indications are delusive, the narrative of the temptation must correspond with a real fact in the life of the Saviour. But might it not be the description of a purely moral struggle—of a struggle that was confined to the soul of Jesus? Might not the temptation be a vision occasioned by the state of exaltation resulting from a prolonged fast, in which the brilliant image of the Jewish Messiah was presented to His imagination under the most seductive forms? (Eichhorn, Paulus). Or might not this narrative be a condensed summary of a long series of intense meditations, in which, after having opened His soul with tender sympathy to all the aspirations of His age and people, Jesus had decidedly broken with them, and determined, with a full knowledge of the issue, to become solely the Messiah of God? (Ullmann.) In the first case, the heart whence came this carnal dream could no longer be the heart of the Holy One of God, and the perfectly pure life and conscience of Jesus become inexplicable. As to the second form in which this opinion is presented, it contains undoubtedly elements of truth. The last two temptations certainly correspond with the most prevalent and ardent aspirations of the Jewish people—the expectation of a political Messiah and the thirst for external signs (*σημεῖα αἰτεῖν*, 1 Cor. 1 : 22). 1. But how, from this point of view, is the first temptation to be explained? 2. How could the figure of a personal tempter find its way into such a picture? How did it become its predominating feature, so as to form almost the entire picture in Mark's narrative? 3. Have we not the authentic comment of Jesus Himself on this conflict in the passage 11 : 21, 22, already referred to (p. 135)? In describing this victory over *the strong man* by *the man stronger than he*, and laying it down as a condition absolutely indispensable to the spoiling of the stronghold of the former, did not Jesus allude to a *personal* conflict between Himself and the prince of this world, such as we find portrayed in the narrative of the temptation? For these reasons, Keim, while he recognizes in the temptation, with Ullmann, a sublime fact in the moral life of Jesus, an energetic determination of His will by which He absolutely renounced any deviation whatever from the divine will, notwithstanding the insufficiency of human means, confesses that he cannot refuse to admit the possibility of the existence and interposition of the representative of the powers of evil.

Here we reach the only explanation which, in our opinion, can account for the narrative of the temptation. As there is a mutual contact of bodies, so also, in a higher sphere than that of matter, there is an action and reaction of spirits on each other. It was in this higher sphere to which Jesus was raised, that He, the representative of voluntary dependence and filial love to God, met that spirit in whom the autonomy of the creature finds its most resolute representative, and in every way, and notwithstanding all this spirit's craft, maintained by conscientious choice His

own ruling principle. This victory decided the fate of mankind; it became the foundation of the establishment of God's kingdom upon earth. This is the essential significance of this event. As to the narrative in which this mysterious scene has been disclosed to us, it must be just a symbolical picture, by means of which Jesus endeavored to make His disciples understand a fact which, from its very nature, could only be fitly described in figurative language. Still we must remember, that Jesus being really man, having His spirit united to a body, He needed, quite as much as we do, sensible representations as a means of apprehending spiritual facts. Metaphorical language was as natural in His case as in ours. In all probability, therefore, it was necessary, in order to His fully entering into the conflict between Himself and the tempter, that it should assume the scenic (*plastique*) form in which it has been preserved to us. While saying this, we do not think that Jesus was transported bodily by Satan through the air. We believe that, had He been observed by any spectator while the temptation was going on, He would have appeared all through it motionless upon the soil of the desert. But though the conflict did not pass out of the *spiritual* sphere, it was none the less real, and the value of this victory was not less incalculable and decisive. This view, with some slight shades of difference, is that advocated by Theodore of Mopsuestia in the ancient Church, by some of the Reformers, and by several modern commentators (Olshausen, Neander, Oosterzee, Pressensé, etc.).

But could Jesus be really *tempted*, if He was holy? could He *sin*, if He was the Son of God? *fail* in His work, if He was the Redeemer appointed by God? As a holy being, He could be tempted, because a conflict might arise between some legitimate bodily want or normal desire of the soul, and the divine will, which for the time forbade its satisfaction. The Son could sin, since He had renounced His divine mode of existence *in the form of God* (Phil. 2 : 6), in order to enter into a human condition altogether like ours. The Redeemer might succumb, if the question be regarded from the standpoint of His personal liberty; which is quite consistent with God being assured by His foreknowledge that He would stand firm. This foreknowledge was one of the factors of His plan, precisely as the foreknowledge of the faith of believers is one the elements of His eternal *πρόθεσις* (Rom. 8 : 20).

2*d*. *Object of the Temptation.*—The temptation is the complement of the baptism. It is the *negative* preparation of Jesus for His ministry, as the baptism was His *positive* preparation. In His baptism Jesus received impulse, calling, strength. By the temptation He was made distinctly conscious of the errors to be shunned, and the perils to be feared, on the right hand and on the left. The temptation was the last act of His moral education; it gave Him an insight into all the ways in which His Messianic work could possibly be marred. If, from the very first step in His arduous career, Jesus kept the path marked out by God's will without deviation, change, or hesitancy, this bold front and steadfast perseverance are certainly due to His experience of the temptation. All the wrong courses possible to Him were thenceforth known; all the rocks had been observed; and it was the enemy himself who had rendered Him this service. And it was for this reason that God apparently delivered Him for a brief time into his power. This is just what Matthew's narrative expresses so forcibly: "He was led up of the Spirit . . . *to be tempted*." When He left this school, Jesus distinctly understood that, as respects His *person*, no act of His ministry was to have any tendency to lift it out of His human condition; that, as to His work, it was to be in no way assimilated to the action of the powers of this world; and that in the *employment* of divine power filial liberty was never to become caprice, not even under a pretext of blind trust in the help of God. And this programme was carried out. His material wants were supplied by the gifts of charity (8 : 3), not by miracles; His mode of life was nothing else than a perpetual humiliation—a prolongation, so to speak, of His incarnation. When laboring to establish His kingdom, He unhesitatingly refused the aid of human power—as, for instance, when the multitude wished to make Him a king (John 6 : 15); and His ministry assumed the character of an exclusively spiritual conquest. He abstained, lastly, from every miracle which had not for its immediate design the revelation of moral perfection, that is to say, of the glory of His Father (Luke 11 : 29). These supreme rules of the Messianic activity were all learned in that school of trial through which God caused Him to pass in the desert.

3*d*. *The Narratives of the Temptation.*—It has been maintained that, since John

does not relate the temptation, he *de facto* denies it. But, as we have already observed, the starting-point of his narrative belongs to a later time. The narrative of Mark (1 : 12, 13), is very summary indeed. It occupies in some respects a middle place between the other two, approaching Matthew's in the preface and close (the ministration of the angels), and Luke's in the extension of the temptation to forty days. But it differs from both in omitting the three particular temptations, and by the addition of the incident of the wild beasts. Here arises, for those who maintain that one of our Gospels was the source of the other, or of both the others, the following dilemma : Either the original narrative is Mark's, which the other two have amplified (Meyer), or Mark has given a summary of the two others (Bleek). There is yet a third alternative, by which Holtzmann escapes this dilemma : There was an original Mark, and its account was transferred *in extenso* into Luke and Matthew, but abridged by our canonical Mark. This last supposition appears to us inadmissible ; for if Matthew and Luke drew from *the same* written source, how did the strange reversal in the order of the two temptations happen ? Schleiermacher supposes—and modern criticism approves the suggestion (Holtzmann, p. 213)—that Luke altered the order of Matthew in order not to change the scene so frequently, by making Jesus leave the desert (for the temple), and then return to it (for the mountain). We really wonder how men can seriously put forward such puerilities. Lastly, if the three evangelists drew from the same source, the Proto-Mark, whence is the mention of the wild beasts in our canonical Mark derived ? The evangelist cannot have imagined it without any authority ; and if it was mentioned in the common source, it could not have been passed over, as Holtzmann admits (p. 70), by Luke and Matthew. The explanation of the latter critic being set aside, there remains the original dilemma. Have Matthew and Luke amplified Mark ? How then does it happen that they coincide, not only in that part which they have in common with Mark, but quite as much, and even more, in that which is wanting in Mark (the detail of the three temptations) ? How is it, again that Matthew confines the temptation to the last moment, in opposition to the narrative of Mark and Luke ; that Luke omits the succor brought to Jesus by the angels, contrary to the account of Mark and Matthew ; and that Luke and Matthew omit the detail of the wild beasts, in opposition to their source, the narrative of Mark ? They amplify, and yet they abridge ! On the other hand, is Mark a compiler from Matthew and Luke ? How, then, is it that he says not a word about the forty days' fast ? It is alleged that he desires to avoid long discourses. But this lengthened fast belongs to the facts, not to the words. Besides, whence does he get the fact about the wild beasts ? He abridges, and yet he amplifies !

All these difficulties which arise out of this hypothesis, and which can only be removed by supposing that the evangelists used their authorities in an inconceivably arbitrary way, disappear of themselves, if we admit, as the common source of the three narratives, an oral tradition which circulated in the Church, and reproduced, more or less exactly, the original account given by Jesus and transmitted by the apostles. Mark only wished to give a brief account, which was all that appeared to him necessary for his readers. The preaching of Peter to Cornelius (Acts 10 : 37, *et seq.*) furnishes an example of this mode of condensing the traditional accounts. Mark had perhaps heard the detail relative to the wild beasts from the mouth of Peter himself. The special aim of his narrative is to show us in Jesus the holy man raised to his original dignity, as Lord over nature (the wild beasts), and the friend of heaven (the angels). Matthew has reproduced the apostolic tradition, in the form which it had specially taken in the Jewish-Christian churches. Of this we have two indications : 1. The *ritualistic* character which is given in this narrative to the fasting of Jesus (*having fasted*) ; 2. The order of the last two temptations, according to which the peculiarly Messianic temptation is exhibited as the supreme and decisive act of the conflict. As to Luke, the substance of his narrative is the same apostolic tradition ; but he was enabled by certain written accounts, or means of information, to give some details with greater exactness—to restore, for example, the actual order of the three temptations. We find him here, as usual, more complete than Mark, and more exact, historically speaking, than Matthew.

And now, His position thus made clear, with God for His sure ally, and Satan for His declared adversary, Jesus advances to the field of battle.

THIRD PART.

THE MINISTRY OF JESUS IN GALILEE.

CHAP. 4 : 14, 9 : 50.

THE three Synoptics all connect the narrative of the Galilæan ministry with the account of the temptation. But the narrations of Matthew and Mark have this peculiarity, that, according to them, the motive for the return of Jesus to Galilee must have been the imprisonment of John the Baptist : "Now when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, He departed into Galilee" (Matt. 4 : 12) ; "Now, after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee" (Mark 1 : 14). As the temptation does not appear to have been coincident with the apprehension of John, the question arises, Where did Jesus spend the more or less lengthened time that intervened between these two events, and what was He doing during the interval? This is the first difficulty. There is another : How could the apprehension of John the Baptist have induced Jesus to return to Galilee, to the dominions of this very Herod who was keeping John in prison? Luke throws no light whatever on these two questions which arise out of the narrative of the Syn., because he makes no mention in this place of the imprisonment of John, but simply connects the commencement of the ministry of Jesus with the victory He had just achieved in the desert. It is John who gives the solution of these difficulties. According to him, there were two returns of Jesus to Galilee, which his narrative distinguishes with the greatest care. The first took place immediately after the baptism and the temptation (1 : 44). It was then that He called some young Galilæans to follow Him, who were attached to the forerunner, and shared his expectation of the Messiah. The second is related in chap. 4 : 1 ; John connects it with the Pharisees' jealousy of John the Baptist, which explains the account of the first two Syn. It appears, in fact, according to him, that some of the Pharisees were party to the blow which had struck John, and therefore we can well understand that Jesus would be more distrustful of them than even of Herod.* That the Pharisees had a hand in John's imprisonment, is confirmed by the expression *delivered*, which Matthew and Mark employ. It was they who had caused him to be seized and delivered up to Herod.

The two returns mentioned by John were separated by quite a number of events : the transfer of Jesus' place of residence from Nazareth to Capernaum ; His first journey to Jerusalem to attend the Passover ; the interview with Nicodemus ; and a period of prolonged activity in Judæa, simultaneous with that of John the Baptist, who was still enjoying his liberty (John 2 : 12 ; 4 : 43). The second return to Galilee,

* Bäumlein, "Comment. über das Evang. Joh." p. 8.

which terminated this long ministry in Judæa, did not take place, according to 4 : 35, until the month of December in this same year, so that at least twelve months elapsed between it and the former. The Syn., relating only a single return, must have blended the two into one. Only there is this difference between them, that in Matthew and Mark it is rather the idea of the second which seems to predominate, since they connect it with John's imprisonment ; while Luke brings out more the idea of the first, for he associates it with the temptation exclusively. The mingling of these two analogous facts—really, however, separated by almost a year—must have taken place previously in the oral tradition, since it passed, though not without some variations, into our three Synoptics. The narrative of John was expressly designed to re-establish this lost distinction (comp. John 2 : 11, 3 : 24, 4 : 54). In this way in the Syn. the interval between these two returns to Galilee disappeared, and the two residences in Galilee, which were separated from each other by this ministry in Judæa, form in them one continuous whole. Further, it is difficult to determine in which of the two to place the several facts which the Syn. relate at the commencement of the Galilæan ministry.

We must not forget that the apostolic preaching, and the popular teaching given in the churches, were directed not by any historical interest, but with a view to the foundation and confirmation of faith. Facts of a similar nature were therefore grouped together in this teaching until they became completely inseparable. We shall see, in the same way, the different journeys to Jerusalem, fused by tradition into a single pilgrimage, placed at the end of Jesus' ministry. Thus the great contrast which prevails in the synoptical narrative between Galilee and Jerusalem is explained. It was only when John, not depending on tradition, but drawing from his own personal recollections, restored to this history its various phases and natural connections, that the complete picture of the ministry of Jesus appeared before the eyes of the Church.

But why did not Jesus commence His activity in Galilee, as, according to the Syn., He would seem to have done. The answer to this question is to be found in John 4 : 43–45. In that country, where He spent His youth, Jesus would necessarily expect to meet, more than anywhere else, with certain prejudices opposed to the recognition of His Messianic dignity. "A prophet hath no honor in his own country" (John 4 : 44). This is why He would not undertake His work among His Galilæan fellow-countrymen until after He had achieved some success elsewhere. The reputation which preceded His return would serve to prepare His way among them (John 4 : 45). He had therefore Galilee in view even during this early activity in Judæa. He foresaw that this province would be the cradle of His Church ; for the yoke of pharisaical and sacerdotal despotism did not press so heavily on it as on the capital and its neighborhood. The chords of human feeling, paralyzed in Judæa by false devotion, still vibrated in the hearts of these mountaineers to frank and stirring appeals, and their ignorance appeared to Him a medium more easily penetrable by light from above than the perverted enlightenment of rabbinical science. Comp. the remarkable passage, 10 . 21.

It is not easy to make out the plan of this part, for it describes a continuous progress without any marked breaks ; it is a picture of the inward and outward progress of the work of Jesus in Galilee. Ritschl is of opinion that the progress of the story is determined by the growing hostility of the adversaries of Jesus ; and accordingly he adopts this division : 4 . 16, 6 : 11, absence of conflict ; 6 : 12, 11 : 54, the hostile

attitude assumed by the two adversaries toward each other. But, *first*, the first symptoms of hostility break out before 6 : 12 ; *second*, the passage 9 : 51, which is passed over by the division of Ritschl, is evidently, in the view of the author, one of the principal connecting links in the narrative ; *third*, the growing hatred of the adversaries of Jesus is only an accident of His work, and in no way the governing motive of its development. It is not there, therefore, that we must seek the principle of the division. The author appears to us to have marked out a route for himself by a series of facts, in which there is a gradation easily perceived. At first Jesus preaches without any following of regular disciples ; soon He calls about Him some of the most attentive of His hearers, to make them His permanent disciples , after a certain time, when these disciples had become very numerous, He raises twelve of them to the rank of apostles ; lastly, He intrusts these twelve with their first mission, and makes them His evangelists. This gradation in the position of His helpers naturally corresponds, *first*, with the internal progress of His teaching , *second*, with the local extension of His work ; *third*, with the increasing hostility of the Jews, with whom Jesus breaks more and more, in proportion as He gives organic form to His own work. It therefore furnishes a measure of the entire movement. We are guided by it to the following division :

First Cycle, 4 : 14–44, extending to the call of the first disciples.

Second Cycle, 5 : 1, 6 : 11, to the nomination of the twelve.

Third Cycle, 6 : 12, 8 : 56, to their first mission.

Fourth Cycle, 9 : 1–50, to the departure of Jesus for Jerusalem.

At this point the work of Jesus in Galilee comes to an end ; He bids adieu to this field of labor, and, setting His face toward Jerusalem, He carries with Him into Judæa the result of His previous labors, His Galilæan Church.

FIRST CYCLE.—CHAP. 4 : 14–44.

Visits to Nazareth and to Capernaum.

The following narratives are grouped around two names—Nazareth (vers. 14–30) and Capernaum (vers. 31–44).

1. Visit to Nazareth : vers. 14–30. This portion opens with a general glance at the commencement of the active labors of Jesus in Galilee : 14, 15. Then, resting on this foundation, but separable from it, as a particular example, we have the narrative of His preaching at Nazareth : vers. 16–30.

First Vers. 14, 15. The 14th verse is, as we have shown, the complement of ver 1 (see ver. 1) The verb, *he returned*, comprehends, according to what precedes, the two returns mentioned, John 1 : 44 and 4 : 1, and even a third, understood between John 5 and 6. The words, *in the power of the Spirit*, do not refer, as many have thought, to an impulse from above, which urged Jesus to return to Galilee, but to His possession of the divine powers which He had received at His baptism, and with which He was now about to teach and act ; comp. *filled with the Spirit*, ver. 1. Luke evidently means that he returned different from what he was when He left. Was this supernatural power of Jesus displayed solely in His preaching, or in miracles also already wrought at this period, though not related by Luke? Since the miracle at Cana took place, according to John, just at this time, we incline to the latter meaning, which, considering the term employed, is also the more natural. In this way, what is said of His fame, which immediately spread through all the region

round about, is readily explained. Preaching alone would scarcely have been sufficient to have brought about this result. Meyer brings in here the report of the miraculous incidents of the baptism ; but these probably had not been witnessed by any one save Jesus and John, and no allusion is made to them subsequently. The 15th verse relates how, after His reputation had prepared the way for Him, He came *Himself* (αὐτός) ; then how they all, after hearing Him, ratified the favorable judgment which His fame had brought respecting Him (*glorified of all*). The synagogues, in which Jesus fulfilled His itinerant ministry, were places of assembly existing from the return of the captivity, perhaps even earlier. (Bleek finds the proof of an earlier date in Ps. 74 : 8.) Wherever there was a somewhat numerous Jewish population, even in heathen countries, there were such places of worship. They assembled in them on the Sabbath day, also on the Monday and Tuesday, and on court and market days. Any one wishing to speak signified his intention by rising (at least according to this passage ; comp. also Acts 13 : 16). But as all teaching was founded on the Scriptures, to speak was before anything else *to read*. The reading finished, he taught, sitting down (Acts 13 : 16, Paul speaks standing). Order was maintained by the ἀρχισυναμωγοι, or presidents of the synagogue. Vers. 14 and 15 form the fourth definite statement in the account of the development of the person and work of Jesus ; comp. 2 : 40, 52, and 3 : 23.

Second. Vers. 16–30. Jesus did not begin by preaching at Nazareth. In His view, no doubt, the inhabitants of this city stood in much the same relation to the people of the rest of Galilee as the inhabitants of Galilee to the rest of the Jewish people ; He knew that in a certain sense His greatest difficulties would be encountered there, and that it would be prudent to defer his visit until the time when His reputation, being already established in the rest of the country, would help to counteract the prejudice resulting from His former lengthened connection with the people of the place.

Vers. 16–19.* The Reading.—Ver. 16. *Καί.* "And in these itinerancies He came also." John (2 : 12) and Matthew (4 : 13) refer to this time the transfer of the residence of Jesus (and also, according to John, of that of His mother and brethren) from Nazareth to Capernaum, which naturally implies a visit to Nazareth. Besides, John places the miracle at the marriage at Cana at the same time. Now, Cana being such a very short distance from Nazareth, it would have been an affectation on the part of Jesus to be staying so near His native town, and not visit it. The words, *where He had been brought up*, assign the motive of His proceeding. The expression, *according to His custom*, cannot apply to the short time which had elapsed since His return to Galilee, unless, with Bleek, we regard it as an indication that this event is of later date, which indeed is possible, but in no way necessary. It rather applies to the period of His childhood and youth. This remark is in close connection with the words, *where he had been brought up.* Attendance at the synagogue was, as Keim has well brought out (t. i. p. 434), a most important instrument in the religious and

* Ver. 16. T. R., with K. L. Π. many Mnn., Ναζαρετ (ς^ε—ρεθ with 11 Mjj.) ; D., Ναζαρεδ ; ℵ. B.* Z. Ναζαρα ; A., Ναζαρατ ; Δ., Ναζαραθ. Ver. 17. A. B. L. Z. Syr. read ανοιξας instead of αναπτυξας, which is the reading of 16 Mjj. Mnn. B. It. Ver. 18. Twenty Mjj. read ευαγγελισασθαι instead of ευαγγελιζεσθαι, which is the reading of T. R. with merely some Mnn. Ver. 19. ℵ. B. D. L. Z. It. omit the words ιασασθαι τ. συντετρ. τ. καρδιαν, which is the reading of T. R. with 15 Mjj., the greater part of the Mnn. Syr.

intellectual development of Jesus. Children had access to this worship from the age of five or six ; they were compelled to attend it when they reached thirteen (Keim, t. i. p. 431). But it was not solely by means of these Scripture lessons, heard regularly in the synagogue several times a week, that Jesus learned to know the O. T. so well. There can be no doubt, as Keim says, that He possessed a copy of the sacred book Himself. Otherwise He would not have known how to read, as He is about to do here. The received reading, *having unrolled*, ver. 17, is preferable to the Alex. var., *having opened*. The sacred volumes were in the form of rectangular sheets, rolled round a cylinder. By the expression, *He found*, Luke gives us to understand that Jesus, surrendering Himself to guidance from above, read at the place where the roll opened of itself. We cannot then infer, as Bengel does, from the fact of this passage being read by the Jews on the day of atonement, that this feast was being observed on that very day. Besides, the present course of the Haphtaroth, or readings from the prophets, dates from a later period.

This passage belongs to the second part of Isaiah (61 : 1 *et seq.*). This long consecutive prophecy is generally applied to the return from the captivity. The only term which would suggest this explanation in our passage is *αἰχμαλώτοις*, properly *prisoners of war*, ver. 19. But this word is used with a more general meaning. St. Paul applies it to his companions in work and activity (Col. 4 : 10). The term *πτωχός*, *poor*, rather implies that the people are settled in their own country. The remarkable expression, *to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord*, makes the real thought of the prophet sufficiently clear. There was in the life of the people of Israel a year of grace, which might very naturally become a type of the Messianic era. This was the year of Jubilee, which returned every fifty years (Lev. 26). By means of this admirable institution, God had provided for a periodical social restoration in Israel. The Israelite who had sold himself into slavery regained his liberty ; families which had alienated their patrimony recovered possession ; a wide amnesty was granted to persons imprisoned for debt—so many types of the work of Him who was to restore spiritual liberty to mankind, to free them from their guilt, and restore to them their divine inheritance. Jesus, therefore, could not have received from His Father a text more appropriate to His present position—the inauguration of His Messianic ministry amid the scenes of His previous life.

The first words, *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me*, are a paraphrase of the term משיח, Messiah (Χριστός, Anointed). Jesus, in reading these words, could not but apply them to His recent baptism. The expression *ἐιεκεν οὗ* cannot signify here *wherefore* : " The Spirit is upon me ; wherefore God hath anointed me ;" this would be contrary to the meaning. The LXX have used this conjunction to translate יען, which in the original signifies, just as יען אשר, *because*, a meaning which the Greek expression will also bear (*on this account that, propterea quod*). On the first day of the year of Jubilee, the priests went all through the land, announcing with sound of trumpets the blessings brought by the opening year (*jubilee*, from יבל, *to sound a trumpet*). It is to this proclamation of grace that the words, *to announce good news to the poor*, undoubtedly allude, Lev. 25 : 6, 14, 25. The words, *to heal the broken in heart*, which the Alex. reading omits, might have been introduced into the text from the O. T. ; but, in our view, they form the almost indispensable basis of the word of Jesus, ver. 23. We must therefore retain them, and attribute their omission to an act of negligence occasioned by the long string of infinitives. The term *κηρύξαι ἄφεσιν*, *to proclaim liberty*, employed ver. 19, also alludes to the solemn proclamation

of the jubilee. This word ἄφεσιν is found at almost every verse, in the LXX., in the statute enjoining this feast. Bleek himself observes that the formula קרא דרור, which corresponds to those two Greek terms, is that which is employed in connection with the jubilee ; but notwithstanding, this does not prevent his applying the passage, according to the common prejudice, to the return from the captivity ! The prisoners who recovered their freedom are amnestied malefactors as well as slaves set free at the beginning of this year of grace. The image of the blind restored to sight does not, at the first glance, accord with that of the jubilee ; but it does not any better suit the figure of the return from the captivity. And if this translation of the Hebrew text were accurate, we should have in either case to allow that the prophet had departed from the general image with which he had started. But the term in Isaiah (אסירים, properly *bound*) denotes *captives*, not blind persons. The expression פקח קוח signifies, it is true, the opening of the eyes, not the opening of a prison. But the captives coming forth from their dark dungeon are represented under the figure of blind men suddenly restored to sight. The words, *to set at liberty them that are bruised*, are taken from another passage in Isaiah (58 : 6). Probably in Luke's authority this passage was already combined with the former (as often happens with Paul). The figurative sense of τεθραυσμένοι, *pierced through*, is required by the verb to *send away*. The acceptable year of the Lord is that in which He is pleased to show mankind extraordinary favors. Several Fathers have inferred from this expression that the ministry of Jesus only lasted a single year. This is to confound the type and the antitype.

Vers. 20–22. *The Preaching.*—The description of the assembly, ver. 20, is so dramatic that it appears to have come from an eye-witness. The sense of ἤρξατο, *He began* (ver. 21), is not that these were the *first words* of His discourse ; this expression describes the solemnity of the moment when, in the midst of a silence resulting from universal attention, the voice of Jesus sounded through the synagogue. The last words of the verse signify literally, "This word is accomplished in your ears ;" in other words, "This preaching to which you are now listening is itself the realization of this prophecy." Such was the text of Jesus' discourse. Luke, without going into His treatment of His theme (comp., for example, Matt. 11 : 28–30), passes (ver. 22) to the impression produced. It was generally favorable. The term *bare witness* alludes to the favorable reports which had reached them ; they proved for themselves that His fame was not exaggerated. Ἐθαύμαζον signifies here, *they were astonished* (John 7 : 21 ; Mark 6 : 6), rather than *they admired*. Otherwise the transition to what follows would be too abrupt. So the term *gracious words* describes rather the matter of Jesus' preaching—its description of the works of divine grace—than the impression received by His hearers. They were astonished at this enumeration of marvels hitherto unheard of. The words, *which proceeded forth out of His mouth*, express the fulness with which this proclamation poured forth from His heart.

Two courses were here open to the inhabitants of Nazareth : either to surrender themselves to the divine instinct which, while they listened to this call, was drawing them to Jesus as the anointed of whom Isaiah spake ; or to give place to an intellectual suggestion, allow it to suppress the emotion of the heart, and cause faith to evaporate in criticism. They took the latter course : *Is not this Joseph's son?* Announcements of such importance appeared to them altogether out of place in the mouth of this young man, whom they had known from his childhood. What a contrast between the cold reserve of this question, and the enthusiasm which wel-

comed Jesus everywhere else (glorified *of all*, ver, 15)! For them this was just such a critical moment as was to occur soon after for the inhabitants of Jerusalem (John 2 : 13–22). Jesus sees at a glance the bearing of this remark which went round among His hearers: when the impression He has produced ends in a question of curiosity, all is lost; and He tells them so.

Vers. 23–27.* *The Colloquy.*—"And He said to them, Ye will surely say unto me this proverb, Physician, heal thyself; whatsoever we have heard done in Capernaum, do also here in thy country. 24. And He said, Verily I say unto you, No prophet is accepted in his own country. 25. But I tell you of a truth, many widows were in Israel in the days of Elias, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, when great famine was throughout all the land; 26. But unto none of them was Elias sent, save unto Sarepta, a city of Sidon, unto a woman that was a widow. 27. And many lepers were in Israel in the time of Eliseus the prophet; and none of them was cleansed, saving Naaman the Syrian." The meaning *surely*, which πάντως often has, would be of no force here; it rather means *wholly, nothing less than:*" "The question which you have just put to me is only the first symptom of unbelief. From surprise you will pass to derision. Thus you will quickly arrive at the end of the path in which you have just taken the first step." The term παραβολή, *parable*, denotes any kind of figurative discourse, whether a complete narrative or a short sentence, couched in an image, like proverbs. Jesus had just attributed to Himself, applying Isaiah's words, the office of a restorer of humanity. He had described the various ills from which His hearers were suffering, and directed their attention to Himself as the physician sent to heal them. This is what the proverb cited refers to. (Comp. ἰατρός, a physician, with ἰάσασθαι, *to heal*, ver. 18). Thus: "You are going even to turn to ridicule what you have just heard, and to say to me, Thou who pretendest to save humanity from its misery, begin by delivering thyself from thine own." But, as thus explained, the proverb does not appear to be in connection with the following proposition. Several interpreters have proposed another explanation: "Before attempting to save mankind, raise *thy native town* from its obscurity, and make it famous by miracles like those which thou must have wrought at Capernaum." But it is very forced to explain the word *thyself* in the sense of *thy native town*. The connection of this proverb with the following words is explained, if we see in the latter a suggestion of *the means* by which Jesus may yet prevent the contempt with which He is threatened in His own country: "In order that we may acknowledge you to be what you claim, the Saviour of the people, do here some such miracle as it is said thou hast done at Capernaum." This speech betrays an ironical doubt respecting those marvellous things which were attributed to Him.

It appears from this passage, as well as from Matt. 13 : 58 and Mark 6 : 5, that Jesus performed no miracles at Nazareth. It is even said that "He could do no miracle there." It was a moral impossibility, as in other similar instances (Luke 11 : 16, 29; 23 : 35). It proceeded from the spirit in which the demand was made: it was a miracle of ostentation that was required of Him (the third temptation in the desert); and it was what He could not grant, without *doing what the Father had not shown Him*

* Ver. 23. ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn. read εις την instead of εν τη. Ver. 24. Καφαρναουμ in ℵ. B. D. X. It. Vg. instead of Καπερναουμ which is the reading of T. R. with 15 other Mjj. the Mnn. and Vss. Very nearly the same in the other passages. Ver. 27. The MSS. are divided between Σιδωνιας (Alex.) and Σιδωνος (T. R. Byz.). Marcion probably placed this verse after 17 : 19.

(John 5 : 19, 30). The allusion to the miracles at Capernaum creates surprise, because none of them have been recorded ; and modern interpreters generally find in these words a proof of the chronological disorder which here prevails in Luke's narrative. He must have placed this visit much too soon. This conclusion, however, is not so certain as it appears. The expression, *in the power of the Spirit* (ver. 14), contains by implication, as we have seen, an indication of miracles wrought in those early days, and among these we must certainly rank the miracle at the marriage feast at Cana (John 2). This miracle was followed by a residence at Capernaum (John 2 : 12), during which Jesus may have performed some miraculous works : and it was not till after that that He preached publicly at Nazareth. These early miracles have been effaced by subsequent events, as that at Cana would have been, if John had not rescued it from oblivion. If this is so, the twenty-third verse, which seems at first sight not to harmonize with the previous narrative, would just prove with what fidelity Luke has preserved the purport of the sources whence he drew his information. John in the same way makes allusion (2 : 22) to miracles which he has not recorded. The preposition εἰς before the name *Capernaum* appears to be the true reading : "done *at* and *in favor of* Capernaum."

The δέ (ver. 24) indicates opposition. "So far from seeking to obtain your confidence by a display of miracles, I shall rather accept, as a prophet, the fate of all the prophets." The proverbial saying here cited by Jesus is found in the scene Matt. 13 and Mark 6, and, with some slight modification, in John 4 : 44. None have more difficulty in discerning the exceptional character of an extraordinary man than those who have long lived with him on terms of familiarity. The δέ (ver. 25) is again of an adversative force : If by your unbelief you prevent my being your physician, there are others whom you will not prevent me from healing. The expression *verily* announces something important ; and it is evident that the application of the saying, ver. 24, in the mind of Jesus, has a much wider reference than the instance before Him ; Nazareth becomes, in His view, a type of unbelieving Israel. This is proved by the two following examples, which refer to the relations of Israel with the heathen. He speaks of a famine of three years and a half. From the expressions of the O. T., *during these years* (1 Kings 17 : 1), and *the third year* (18 : 1), we can only in strictness infer a drought of two years and a half. But as this same figure, *three years and a half*, is found in Jas. 5 : 17, it was probably a tradition of the Jewish schools. The reasoning would be this : The famine must have lasted for a certain time after the drought. There would be a desire also to make out the number which, ever since the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, had become the emblem of times of national calamity. The expression, *all the land*, denotes the land of Israel, with the known countries bordering upon it. The Alex. reading Σιδωνίας, *the territory of Sidon*, may be a correction derived from the LXX. The reading Σιδῶνος, the city of Sidon itself, makes the capital the centre on which the surrounding cities depend. The somewhat incorrect use of εἰ μή, *except*, is explained by the application of this restriction not to the special notion of *Israelitish* widowhood, but to the idea of *widowhood* in general ; the same remark applies to ver. 27, Matt. 12 : 4, Gal. 1 . 19, and other passages. The second example (ver. 27) is taken from 2 Kings 5 : 14. The passage 2 Kings 7 : 3 and some others prove how very prevalent leprosy was in Israel at this time. The prophecy contained in these examples is being fulfilled to this hour : Israel is deprived of the works of grace and marvels of healing which the Messiah works among the Gentiles.

Vers. 28–30.* *Conclusion.*—The threat contained in these examples exasperates them: "Thou rejectest us: we reject thee," was their virtual reply. The term ἐκβάλλειν, *to cast out*, denotes that they set upon Him with violence. About forty minutes distant from Nazareth, to the south-east, they show a wall of rock eighty feet high, and (if we add to it a second declivity which is found a little below) about 300 feet above the plain of Esdraelon. It is there that tradition places this scene. But Robinson regards this tradition as of no great antiquity. Besides, it does not agree with the expression: *on which the city was built.* Nazareth spreads itself out upon the eastern face of a mountain, where there is a perpendicular wall of rock from 40 to 50 feet high. This nearer locality agrees better with the text. The ὥστε of the Alex. reading signifies: *so as to be able* to cast Him down. It was for that purpose that they took the trouble of going up so high. This reading is preferable to the T. R.: εἰς τό, *for the purpose of.* The deliverance of Jesus was neither a miracle nor an escape; He passed through the group of these infuriated people with a majesty which overawed them. The history offers some similar incidents. We cannot say, as one critic does: "In the absence of any other miracle, He left them this."

The greater part of modern critics regard this scene as identical with that of Matt. 13 and Mark 6, placed by these evangelists at a much later period. They rely, 1*st*, On the expression of surprise: *Is not this the son of Joseph?* and on the proverbial saying, ver. 24, which could not have been repeated twice within a few months; 2*d*, On the absence of miracles common to the two narratives; 3*d*, On the words of ver. 23, which suppose that Jesus had been laboring at Capernaum prior to this visit to Nazareth. But how in this case are the following differences to be explained? 1. In Matthew and Mark there is not a word about the attempt to put Jesus to death. All goes off peaceably to the very end. 2. Where are certain cases of healing recorded by Matthew (ver. 58) and Mark (ver. 5) to be placed? Before the preaching? This is scarcely compatible with the words put into the mouth of the inhabitants of Nazareth (ver. 23, Luke). After the preaching? Luke's narrative absolutely excludes this supposition. 3. Matthew and Mark place the visit which they relate at the culminating point of the Galilæan ministry and toward its close, while Luke commences his account of this ministry with the narrative which we have just been studying. An attempt has been made to explain this difference in two ways: Luke may have wished, in placing this narrative here, to make us see the reason which induced Jesus to settle at Capernaum instead of Nazareth (Bleek, Weizsäcker); or he may have made this scene the opening of Jesus' ministry, because it prefigures the rejection of the Jews and the salvation of the Gentiles, which is the leading idea of his book (Holtzmann). But how is such an arbitrary transposition to be harmonized with his intention of *writing in order*, so distinctly professed by Luke (1:4)? These difficulties have not yet been solved. Is it then impossible, that after a first attempt among His fellow citizens at the beginning of His ministry, Jesus should have made a second later on? On the contrary, is it not quite natural that, before leaving Galilee forever (and thus at the very time to which Matthew and Mark refer their account), He should have addressed Himself once more to the heart of His fellow-countrymen, and that, if He had again found it closed against Him, the shock would nevertheless have been less violent than at the first encounter? However this may be, if the two narratives refer to the same event, as present criticism decides, Luke's appears to me to deserve the preference, and for two reasons: 1. The very dramatic and detailed picture he has drawn leaves no room for doubting the accuracy and absolute originality of the source whence he derived his information; while the narratives of Matthew and Mark betray, by the absence of all distinctive features, their traditional origin. 2. John (4:4) cites, *at the beginning* of his account *of the Galilæan ministry*, the saying recorded by the three evangelists as to the rejection which every prophet must undergo from his own people. He quotes it as a maxim already previously announced

* Ver. 29. ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn., ωστε instead of εις το.

b. Jesus, and which had influenced from the first the course of His ministry. Now, as the three Syn. are agreed in referring this saying to a visit at Nazareth, this quotation in John clearly proves that the visit in question took place at the commencement (Luke), and not in the middle or at the end of the Galilæan ministry (Matthew and Mark). We are thus brought to the conclusions : 1. That the visit related by Luke is historical ; 2. That the recollection of it was lost to tradition, in common with many other facts relating to the beginning of the ministry (marriage at Cana, etc.) ; 3. That it was followed by another toward the end of the Galilæan ministry, in the traditional account of which several incidents were introduced belonging to the former. As to the sojourn at Capernaum, implied in Luke 5 : 23, we have already seen that it is included in the general description, ver. 15. John 2 ; 12 proves that from the first the attention of Jesus was drawn to this city as a suitable place in which to reside. His first disciples lived near it. The synagogue of Capernaum must then have been one of the first in which He preached, and consequently one of those mentioned in ver. 15.

2. *Residence at Capernaum :* vers. 31–44. Five sections : 1*st.* A general survey (vers. 31 and 32) ; 2*d.* The healing of a demoniac (vers. 33–37) ; 3*d.* That of Peter's mother-in-law (vers. 38 and 39) ; 4*th.* Various cures (vers. 40–42) ; 5*th.* Transition to the evangelization of Galilee generally.

First. Vers. 31 and 32. The term, *He went down*, refers to the situation of Capernaum on the sea-shore, in opposition to that of Nazareth on the high land. We have to do here with a permanent abode ; comp. John 2 : 12 and Matt. 4 : 13 (ἐλθὼν κατῴκησεν εἰς K.), as well as the term, *His own city* (Matt. 9 : 1). The name Capernaum or Capharnaum (see critical note, ver. 23) does not occur in the O. T. From this it would seem that it was not a very ancient place. The name may signify, *town of Nahum* (alluding to the prophet of this name), or (with more probability) *town of consolation.* The name, according to Josephus, belonged properly to a fountain ;* in the only passage in which he mentions this town, he calls it Κεφαρνώμη † Until lately, it was very generally admitted that the site of Capernaum was marked by the ruins of Tell-Hum toward the northern end of the lake of Gennesareth, to the west of the embouchure of the Jordan. Since Robinson's time, however, several, and among the rest M. Rénan, have inclined to look for it farther south, in the rich plain where stands at the present day the town of Khan-Minyeh, of which Josephus has left us such a fine description. Keim pronounces very decidedly in favor of this latter opinion, and supports it by reasons of great weight.‡ Agriculture, fishing, and commerce, favored by the road from Damascus to Ptolemais, which passed through or near Capernaum, had made it a flourishing city. It was therefore the most important town of the northern district of the lake country. It was the Jewish, as Tiberias was the heathen, capital of Galilee (a similar relation to that between Jerusalem and Cæsarea).

The 31st and 32d verses form the fifth resting-place or general summary in the narrative (see vers. 14, 15). The analytical form ἦν διδάσκων indicates habit. In the parallel place in Mark, the imperf. ἐδίδασκεν puts the act of teaching in direct and special connection with the following fact. By the authority (ἐξουσία) which characterized the words of Jesus, Luke means, not the power employed in the healing of

* "Bell. Jud." iii. 10, 8 : "To the mildness of the climate is added the advantage of a copious spring, which the inhabitants call Capharnaum."

† Jos. "Vita," § 72

‡ Delitzch, in his little tractate, "Ein Tag in Capernaum," does not hesitate to recognize in the great field of ruins of Tell-Hum the remains of Capernaum.

the demoniac (to express this he would rather have used δύναμις, *force*), but the commanding character which distinguished His teaching. Jesus did not dissect texts, like the Rabbis; He laid down truths which carried with them their own evidence. He spoke as a legislator, not as a lawyer (Matt. 7 . 28, 29). The following incident proves the right He had to teach in this way. It appears that it was with this 31st verse that Marcion commenced his Gospel, prefacing it with the fixing of the date, iii. 1: "In the 15th year of the government of Tiberius, Jesus went down into the town of Galilee called Capernaum."* The complement understood of *went down* was evidently . from heaven. As to the visit to Nazareth. Marcion places it after the scene which follows; this transposition was certainly dictated by ver. 23.

Second. Vers. 33–37. † Should the possessed mentioned by the evangelists be regarded simply as persons afflicted after the same manner as our lunatics, whose derangement was attributed by Jewish and heathen superstition to supernatural influence? Or did God really permit, at this extraordinary epoch in history, an exceptional display of diabolical power? Or, lastly, should certain morbid conditions now existing, which medical science attributes to purely natural causes, either physical or psychical, be put down, at the present day also, to the action of higher causes? These are the three hypotheses which present themselves to the mind. Several of the demoniacs healed by Jesus certainly exhibit symptoms very like those which are observed at the present day in those who are simply afflicted; for example, the epileptic child, Luke 9 : 37 *et seq.*, and parall. These strange conditions in every case, therefore, were based on a real disorder, either physical or physico-psychical. The evangelists are so far from being ignorant of this, that they constantly class the demoniacs under the category of the sick (vers. 40 and 41), never under that of the vicious. The possessed have nothing in common with the *children of the devil* (John 8). Nevertheless these afflicted persons are constantly made a class by themselves. On what does this distinction rest? On this leading fact, that those who are simply sick enjoy their own personal consciousness, and are in possession of their own will; while in the possessed these faculties are, as it were, confiscated to a foreign power, with which the sick person identifies himself (ver. 34, 8 : 30). How is this peculiar symptom to be explained? Josephus, under Hellenic influence, thought that it should be attributed to the souls of wicked men who came after death seeking a domicile in the living. ‡ In the eyes of the people the strange guest was a demon, a fallen angel. This latter opinion Jesus must have shared. Strictly speaking, His colloquies with the demoniacs might be explained by an accommodation to popular prejudice, and the sentiments of those who were thus afflicted; but in His private conversations with His disciples, He must, whatever was true, have disclosed His real thoughts, and sought to enlighten them. But He does nothing of the kind; on the contrary, He gives the apostles and disciples power to *cast out devils* (9 : 1), and to tread on *all the power of the enemy* (10 : 19). In Mark 9 : 29, He distinguishes a certain class of demons that can only be driven out by prayer (and fasting?). In Luke 11 : 21) and parall. He explains the facility with which He casts out demons by the personal victory which He had achieved over Satan at the beginning. He therefore admitted the intervention of this being in these mysterious conditions. If

* Tertullian, "Contra Marc," iv. 7.

† Ver. 33. ℵ. B. L. V. Z. omit λεγων. Ver. 35. ℵ. B. D. L. V. Z. several Mnn. read απο instead of εξ.

‡ "Bell. Jud." vii. 6. 3.

this is so, is it not natural to admit that He who exercised over this, as over all other kinds of maladies, such absolute power, best understood its nature, and that therefore His views upon the point should determine ours?

Are there not times when God permits a superior evil power to invade humanity? Just as God sent Jesus at a period in history when moral and social evil had reached its culminating point, did not He also permit an extraordinary manifestation of diabolical power to take place at the same time? By this means Jesus could be proclaimed externally and visibly as the conqueror of the enemy of men, as He who came to destroy *the works of the devil* in the moral sense of the word (1 John 3 : 8). All the miracles of healing have a similar design. They are signs by which Jesus is revealed as the author of spiritual deliverances corresponding to these physical cures. An objection is found in the silence of the fourth Gospel; but John in no way professed to relate all he knew. He says himself, 20 30, 31, *that there are besides many miracles*, and *different miracles* (πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα), which he does not relate.

As to the present state of things, it must not be compared with the times of Jesus. Not only might the latter have been of an exceptional character; but the beneficent influence which the Gospel has exercised in restoring man to himself, and bringing his conscience under the power of the holy and true God, may have brought about a complete change in the spiritual world. Lastly, apart from all this, is there nothing mysterious, from a scientific point of view, in certain cases of mental derangement, particularly in those conditions in which the will is, as it were, confiscated to, and paralyzed by, an unknown power? And after deduction has been made for all those forms of mental maladies which a discriminating analysis can explain by moral and physical relations, will not an impartial physician agree that there is a residuum of cases respecting which he must say: *Non liquet?*

Possession is a caricature of inspiration. The latter, attaching itself to the moral essence of a man, confirms him forever in the possession of his true self; the former, while profoundly opposed to the nature of the subject, takes advantage of its state of morbid passivity, and leads to the forfeiture of personality. The one is the highest work of God; the other of the devil.

The question has been asked, How could a man in a state of mental derangement, and who would be regarded as unclean (ver. 33), be found in the synagogue? Perhaps his malady had not broken out before as it did at this moment—Luke says literally: *a man who had a spirit* (*an afflatus*) *of an unclean devil.* In this expression, which is only found in Rev. 16 : 14, the term *spirit* or *afflatus* denotes the influence of the unclean devil, of the being who is the author of it. The crisis which breaks out (ver. 34) results from the opposing action of those two powers which enter into conflict with each other—the influence of the evil spirit, and that of the person and word of Jesus. A holy power no sooner begins to act in the sphere in which this wretched creature lives, than the unclean power which has dominion over him feels its empire threatened. This idea is suggested by the contrast between the epithet *unclean* applied to the diabolical spirit (ver. 33), and the address: Thou art the Holy One of God (ver. 34). The exclamation ἔα, *ah!* (ver. 34) is properly the imperative of ἐάω, *let be!* It is a cry like that of a criminal who, when suddenly apprehended by the police, calls out: Loose me! This is also what is meant in this instance by the expression, in frequent use among the Jews with different applications: *What is there between us and thee?* of which the meaning here is: What have we to contend about? What evil have we done thee? The plural *we* does not apply to the devil

and to the possessed, since the latter still identifies himself altogether with the former. The devil speaks in the name of all the other spirits of his kind which have succeeded in obtaining possession of a human being. The perdition which he dreads is being sent into the abyss where such spirits await the judgment (8 : 31). This abyss is the emptiness of a creature that possesses no point of support outside itself—neither in God, as the faithful angels have, nor in the world of sense, as sinful men endowed with a body have. In order to remedy this inward destitution, they endeavor to unite themselves to some human being, so as to enter through this medium into contact with sensible realities. Whenever a loss of this position befalls them, they fall back into the abyss of their empty self-dependence (*vide subjectivité*). The term *Holy One of God* expresses the character in which this being recognized his deadly enemy. We cannot be surprised that such homage should be altogether repugnant to the feelings of Jesus. He did not acknowledge it as the utterance of an individual whose will is free, which is the only homage that can please Him ; and He sees what occasion may be taken from such facts to exhibit His work in a suspicious light (11 : 15). He therefore puts an end to this scene immediately by these two peremptory words (ver. 35) : *Silence!* and *Come out.* By the words ἐξ αὐτοῦ, *of him*, Jesus forcibly distinguishes between the two beings thus far mingled together. This divorce is the condition of the cure. A terrible convulsion marks the deliverance of the afflicted man. The tormentor does not let go his victim without subjecting him to a final torture. The words, *without having done him any hurt*, reproduce in a striking manner the impression of eye-witnesses : they ran toward the unhappy man, expecting to find him dead ; and to their surprise, on lifting him up, they find him perfectly restored.

We may imagine the feelings of the congregation when they beheld such a scene as this, in which the two powers that dispute the empire of mankind had in a sensible manner just come into conflict. Vers. 36 and 37 describe this feeling. Several have applied the expression *this word* (What a word *is* this ! A. V.) to the command of Jesus which the devil had just obeyed. But a reference to ver. 32 obliges us to take the term *word* in its natural sense, the preaching of Jesus in general. The authority with which He taught (ver. 32) found its guarantee in the authority backed by *power* (δύναμις), with which He forced the devils themselves to render obedience. The power which Jesus exercises by His simple word is opposed to the prescriptions and pretences of the exorcists ; His cures differ from theirs, just as His teaching did from that of the scribes. In both cases He speaks as a master.

The account of this miracle is omitted by Matthew. It is found with some slight variations in Mark (1 : 23 *et seq.*). It is placed by him, as by Luke, at the beginning of this sojourn of Jesus at Capernaum Instead of ῥίψαν, *having thrown him*, Mark says, σπαράξαν, *having torn, violently convulsed him.* Instead of *What word is this?* Mark makes the multitude say : *What new doctrine is this?*—an expression which agrees with the sense which we have given to λόγος in Luke. The meaning of the epithet *new* in the mouth of the people might be rendered by the common exclamation : Here is something new ! According to Bleek, Mark borrowed his narrative from Luke. But how very paltry and insignificant these changes would seem ! According to Holtzmann, the original source was the primitive Mark (A.), the narrative of which has been reproduced exactly by our Mark ; while Luke has modified it with a view to exalt the miracle, by changing, for example, *having torn* into *having thrown*, and by adding on his own authority the details, *with a loud voice*, and *without having done him any hurt.* Holtzmann congratulates himself, after this, on having made Luke's dependence on the Proto-Mark quite evident. But the simple

term *word*, which in Luke (ver. 36) supplies the place of Mark's emphatic expression, *this new doctrine*, contradicts this explanation. And if this miracle was in the primitive Mark, from which, according to Holtzmann, Matthew must also have drawn his narrative, how came the latter to omit an incident so striking? Holtzmann's answer is, that this evangelist thought another example of a similar cure, that of the demoniac at Gadara, the more striking; and to compensate for the omission of the healing at Capernaum, he has put down two demoniacs, instead of one, to Gadara . . . ! How can such a childish procedure be imputed to a grave historian?

Third. Vers. 38 and 39.* Peter, according to our narrative, seems to have lived at Capernaum. According to John 1 : 45, he was originally of Bethsaida. The two places were very near, and might have had a common synagogue; or, while originally belonging to the one, Peter might have taken up his abode at the other. The term πενθερά (not μητρυια) proves that Peter was married, which agrees with 1 Cor. 9 : 5. It is possible that from this time Jesus took up His abode in Peter's house, Matt. 17 : 24 *et seq.* According to Mark 1 : 29, His train of disciples consisted, not only of Simon and Andrew, but also of James and John. This already existing association supposes a prior connection between Jesus and these young fishermen, which is explained in John 1. Luke does not name the companions of Jesus. We only see by the words, *she arose and ministered unto them* (ver. 39), that He was not alone. The expression πυρετὸς μέγας does not appear to be used here in the technical sense which it has in ancient books of medicine, where it denotes a particular kind of fever. In Luke, Jesus *bends down* over the sick woman. This was a means of entering into spiritual communication with her; comp. Peter's words to the impotent man (Acts 3 : 4): *Look on me.* In Matthew, He *touches* the sick woman with His hand. This action has the same design. In Mark, He *takes her by the hand* to lift her up. How are these variations to be explained, if all three drew from the same source, or if one derived his account from the other? Luke says, literally, *He rebuked the fever;* as if He saw in the disease some principle hostile to man. This agrees with John 8 : 44, where the devil is called *the murderer of man.* It was doubtless at the time of the evening meal (ver. 40). The first use which the sick woman makes of her recovered strength was to serve up a repast for her guests. Holtzmann finds a proof in the plur. αὐτοῖς, "she served them," that Luke's narrative depends on Mark: for thus far Luke has only spoken of Jesus: *He came down* (ver. 31), *He entered* (ver. 38). But this proof is weak. In the description of the public scene, Luke would only present the principal person, Jesus: while in the account of the domestic scene he would naturally mention also the other persons, since they had all the same need of being waited upon.

In Luke and Mark the position of this narrative is very nearly the same, with merely this difference, that in the latter it follows the calling of the four disciples, while in Luke it precedes it. In Matthew, on the contrary, it is placed very much later—after the Sermon on the Mount. As to the details, Matthew is almost identical with Mark. Thus the two evangelists which agree as to the time (Luke and Mark) differ most as to the details, and the two which come nearest to each other in details (Matthew and Mark) differ considerably as to time. How can this singular relation be explained if they drew from common written sources, or if they copied from each other? Luke here omits Andrew, whom Mark mentions. Why so, if he copied from the primitive Mark? Had he any animosity against Andrew? Holtz-

* Ver. 38. The MSS. are divided between απο and εκ.

mann replies: Because he does not speak of Andrew in what follows. As if, in Mark himself, he was any the more mentioned in the incidents that follow!

Fourth. Vers. 40 and 41.* Here we have one of those periods when the miraculous power of Jesus was most abundantly displayed. We shall meet again with some of these culminating points in the course of His ministry. A similar rhythm is found in the career of the apostles. Peter at Jerusalem (Acts 5 : 15, 16), and Paul at Ephesus (19 : 11, 12), exercise their miraculous power to a degree in which they appear to have exhibited it at no other time in their life; it was at the same time the culminating point of their ministry of the word.

The memory of this remarkable evening must have fixed itself indelibly in the early tradition; for the account of this time has been preserved, in almost identical terms, in our three Syn. The sick came in crowds. The expression, *when the sun was setting*, shows that this time had been waited for. And that not "because it was the cool hour," as many have thought, but because it was the end of the Sabbath, and carrying a sick person was regarded as work (John 5 : 10). The whole city, as Mark, in his simple, natural, and somewhat emphatic style, says, was gathered together at the door. According to our narrative, Jesus made use on this occasion of the laying on of hands. Luke cannot have invented this detail himself; and the others would not have omitted it if it had belonged to their alleged common source of information. Therefore Luke had some special source in which this detail was found, and not this alone. This rite is a symbol of any kind of transmission, whether of a gift or an office (Moses and Joshua, Deut. 34 : 9), or of a blessing (the patriarchal blessings), or of a duty (the transfer to the Levites of the natural functions of the eldest sons in every family), or of guilt (the guilty Israelite laying his hands on the head of the victim), or of the sound, vital strength enjoyed by the person who imparts it (cures). It is not certainly that Jesus could not have worked a cure by His mere word, or even by a simple act of volition. But, in the first place, there is something profoundly human in this act of laying the hand on the head of any one whom one desires to benefit. It is a gesture of tenderness, a sign of beneficial communication such as the heart craves. Then this symbol might be morally necessary. Whenever Jesus avails Himself of any material means to work a cure, whether it be the sound of His voice, or clay made of His spittle, His aim is to establish in the form best adapted to the particular case, a personal tie between the sick person and Himself; for He desires not only to heal, but to effect a restoration to God, by creating in the consciousness of the sick a sense of union with Himself the organ of divine grace in the midst of mankind. This moral aim explains the variety of the means employed. Had they been curative means—of the nature of magnetic passes, for example—they could not have varied so much. But as they were addressed to the sick person's soul, Jesus chose them in such a way that His action was adapted to its character or position. In the case of a deaf mute, He put His fingers into his ears; He anointed the eyes of a blind man with His spittle, etc. In this way their healing appeared as an emanation from His person, and attached them to Him by an indissoluble tie. Their restored life was felt to be dependent on His. The repetition of

* Ver. 40. B. D. Q. X. επιτιθεις instead of επιθεις. B. D. It. Syr., εθεραπευεν instead of εθεραπευσεν. Ver. 41. The MSS. are divided between κραυγαζοντα and κραζοντα. The T. R., with 14 Mjj. almost all the Mnn. Syr., reads ο Χριστος before ο υιος του Θεου, contrary to ℵ. B. C. D. F. L. R. X. Z. It^{plerique}, which omit it.

the act of laying on of hands in each case was with the same view. The sick person, being thus visibly put into a state of physical dependence, would necessarily infer his moral dependence. The Alex. readings ἐπιτίθεις, *laying on*, ἐθεράπευε, *He healed*, must be preferred. The aor. (in the T. R.) indicates the completed act, the imperf. its indefinite continuation : " Laying His hands on each of them, He healed, and kept on healing, as many as came for it."

The demoniacs are mentioned in ver. 41 among the sick, but as forming a class by themselves. This agrees with what we have stated respecting their condition. There must have been some physico-psychical disorganization to afford access to the malign influence. The words ὁ Χριστός are correctly omitted by the Alex. ; they have been taken from the second part of the verse. From the fact that the multitude translated the exclamation of the devils, *Thou art the Son of God*, into this, *It is the Christ*, we have no right to conclude that the two titles were identical. By the former, the devils acknowledged the divine character of this man, who made them feel so forcibly His sovereign power. The latter was the translation of this homage into ordinary speech by the Jewish multitude. Was it the design of the devil to compromise Jesus by stirring up a dangerous excitement in Israel in His favor, or by making it believed that there was a bond of common interest between His cause and theirs ? It is more natural to regard this exclamation as an involuntary homage, an anticipation of that compulsory adoration which all creatures, even those which are *under the earth*, as St. Paul says (Phil. 2 : 10), shall one day render to Jesus. They are before the representative of Him *before whom they tremble* (Jas. 2 : 19). Jesus, who had rejected in the desert all complicity with their head, could not think of deriving advantage from this impure homage.

Fifth. Vers. 42–44.* The more a servant of God exerts himself in outward activity, the more need there is that he should renew his inward strength by meditation. Jesus also was subject to this law. Every morning He had to obtain afresh whatever was needed for the day ; for *He lived by the Father* (John 6 : 57). He went out before day from Peter's house, where no doubt He was staying. Instead of, *And when it was day*, Mark says, *While it was still very dark* (ἐννυχον λίαν). Instead of, *the multitude sought Him*, Mark says, *Simon and they that were with him followed after Him . . . and said unto Him, All men seek Thee.* Instead of, *I must preach*, Mark makes Jesus say, *Let us go, that I may preach . . .* etc. These shades of difference are easily explained, if the substance of these narratives was furnished by oral tradition ; but they become childish if they are drawn from the same written source. Holtzmann thinks that Luke generalizes and obscures the narrative of the primitive Mark. The third evangelist would have labored very uselessly to do that ! Bleek succeeds no better in explaining Mark by Luke, than Holtzmann Luke by Mark. If Mark listened to the narrations of Peter, it is intelligible that he should have added to the traditional narrative the few striking features which are peculiar to him, and particularly that which refers to the part taken by Simon on that day. As we read Mark 1 : 36, 37 we fancy we hear Peter telling the story himself, and saying : " And we found Him, and said to Him, All men seek Thee." These special features, omitted in the general tradition, are wanting in Luke. The words

* Ver. 43. ℵ. B. C. D. L. X. some Mnn., απεσταλην instead of απεσταλμαι. ℵ. B. L. some Mnn., επι τουτο instead of εις τουτο. Ver 44. ℵ. B. D Q., εις τας συναγωγας instead of εν ταις συναγωγαις. ℵ. B. C. L. Q. R., several Mnn., της Ιουδαιας, instead of της Γαλιλαιας.

of Jesus, ver. 43, might be explained by a tacit opposition between the ideas of preaching and healing. "If I stayed at Capernaum, I should soon have nothing else to do but work cures, while I am sent that I may preach also." But in this case the verb εὐαγγελίσασθαι should commence the phrase. On the contrary, the emphasis is on the words, *to other cities* . . . Jesus opposes to the idea of a stationary ministry at Capernaum that of itinerant preaching. The term εὐαγγελίσασθαι, *to tell news*, is very appropriate to express this idea. The message ceases to be news when the preacher remains in the same place. But in this expression of Jesus there is, besides, a contrast between Capernaum, the large city, to which Jesus in no way desires to confine His care, and the smaller towns of the vicinity, designated in Mark by the characteristic term κωμοπόλεις, which are equally intrusted to His love. It is difficult to decide between the two readings, ἀπεστάλην, *I have been sent in order to* . . . and ἀπέσταλμαι, *my mission is to* . . . The second perhaps agrees better with the context. A very similar various reading is found in the parallel passage, Mark 1 : 38 (ἐξῆλθον or ἐξελήλυθα). Mark's term appears to allude to the incarnation; Luke's only refers to the mission of Jesus. The readings εἰς τὰς συναγωγάς and ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, ver. 44, recur in Mark 1 : 39 The former appears less regular, which makes it more probable: Jesus carried the preaching into the synagogues. The absurd reading τῆς Ἰουδαίας, which is found in the six principal Alex., should be a caution to blind partisans of this text.

THE MIRACLES OF JESUS.

We shall here add a few thoughts on the miracles of Jesus in general. Four methods are used to get rid of the miraculous element in the Gospel history: *First.* The explanation called natural, which upholds the credibility of the narrative, but explains the text in such a way that its contents offer nothing extraordinary. This attempt has failed; it is an expedient repudiated at the present day, rationalistic criticism only having recourse to it in cases where other methods are manifestly ineffectual. *Second.* The mythical explanation, according to which the accounts of the miracles would be owing to reminiscences of the miraculous stories of the O. T.—the Messiah could not do less than the prophets—or would be either the product of spontaneous creations of the Christian consciousness, or the accidental result of certain words or parables of Jesus that were misunderstood (the resurrection of Lazarus, *e.g.*, the result of the passage Luke 16 : 31; the cursing of the barren fig-tree, a translation into fact of the parable, Luke 13 : 6–9). But the simple, plain, historical character of our Gospel narratives, so free from all poetical adornment and bombast, defends them against this suspicion. Besides, several accounts of miracles are accompanied by words of Jesus, which in such a case would lose their meaning, but which are nevertheless beyond doubt authentic. For example, the discourse, Matt. 12 : 26 *et seq.*, where Jesus refutes the charge, laid against Him by His adversaries, of casting out devils by the prince of the devils, would have no sense but on the supposition, fully conceded by these adversaries, of the reality of His cures of the possessed. His address to the cities of Galilee, Luke 10 : 12–15, implies the notorious and undisputed reality of numerous miraculous facts in His ministry: for we know of no exegesis which consents to give the term δυνάμεις in this passage the purely moral meaning which M. Colani proposes.* *Third.* The relative hypothesis, according to which these facts must be ascribed to natural laws as yet unknown. This was the explanation of Schleiermacher; in part also it was the explanation of M. Rénan: "The miraculous is only the unexplained." It is in conflict with two insurmountable difficulties: 1.

* See on this subject the fine chapter of Holtzmann, "Die Synopt. Evangelien," § 30; "Die Synoptischen Wunderberichte:" and my lecture on the "Miracles de Jésus," second edition, p. 11 *et seq.*

If certain cures may be explained after a fashion, we may be perfectly sure that no one will ever discover a natural law capable of producing a multiplication of loaves and of cooked fish, a resurrection of the dead, and above all, such an event as the resurrection of Jesus Himself. 2. We must, according to this explanation, attribute to Jesus miracles of scientific knowledge quite as inexplicable as the miracles of power which are now in question. *Fourth.* The psychological explanation. After having got rid of the miracles wrought on external nature (the multiplication of the loaves and the stilling of the storm) by one of the three methods indicated, Keim admits a residuum of extraordinary and indisputable facts in the life of Jesus. These are the cures wrought upon the sick and the possessed. Before him, M. Rénan had spoken of the influence exerted on suffering and nervous people by the contact of a person of finely organized nature (*une personne exquise*). Keim merely, in fact, amplifies this expression. The only real miracles in the history of Jesus—the cures —are to be ascribed, according to him, to moral influence (ethico-psychological, t. ii. p. 162). We reply : 1. That the miracles wrought on nature, which are set aside as mythical, are attested in exactly the same manner as the cures which are admitted. 2. That Jesus wrought these cures with an absolute certainty of success (" Now, in order that ye may know, I say unto thee . . ." " I will ; be thou clean." " Be it unto thee as thou wilt "), and that the effect produced was immediate. These two features are incompatible with the psychological explanation. 3. That if Jesus had known that these cures did not proceed from an order of things above nature, it is inconceivable that He would have offered them as God's testimony in His favor, and as signs of His Messianic dignity. Charlatanism, however s ight, is incompatible with the moral character of Jesus. On the possessed, see pp. 156–7.

Jewish legends themselves bear witness to the reality of Jesus' miracles. " The Son of Stada (a nickname applied to Jesus in the Talmud) brought charms from Egypt in an incision which he had made in his flesh." This is the accusation of the Talmud against Him. Surely, if the Jews had been able to deny His miracles, it would have been a simpler thing to do than to explain them in this way. Lastly, when we compare the miracles of the Gospels with those attributed to Him in the apocryphal writings, we feel what a wide difference there is between tradition and legend.

SECOND CYCLE.—CHAP. 5 : 1 ; 6 : 11.

From the Call of the First Disciples to the Choice of the Twelve.

Up to this time Jesus has been preaching, accompanied by a few friends, but without forming about Him a circle of permanent disciples. As His work grows, He feels it necessary to give it a more definite form. The time has arrived when He deems it wise to attach to Himself, as regular disciples, those whom the Father has given Him. This new phase coincides with that in which His work begins to come into conflict with the established order of things.

This cycle comprises six narratives : 1. The call of the first four disciples (5 : 11) ; 2 and 3. Two cures of the leper and the paralytic (5 : 12–14 and 15–26) ; 4. The call of Levi, with the circumstances connected with it (5 : 27–39) ; 5 and 6. Two conflicts relating to the Sabbath (6 : 1–11).

1. *The Call of the Disciples :* 5 : 1–11.—The companions of Jesus, in the preceding scene, have not yet been named by Luke (they besought Him, 4 : 38 ; she ministered unto them (4 : 39). According to Mark (1 : 29), they were Peter, Andrew, James, and John. These are the very four young men whom we find in this narrative. They had lived up to this time in the bosom of their families, and continued their old occupations. But this state of things was no longer suitable to the part which Jesus designed for them. They were to treasure up all His instructions, be the constant witnesses of His works, and receive from Him a daily moral education.

In order to this it was indispensable that they should be continually with Him. In calling them to leave their earthly occupation, and assigning them in its place one that was wholly spiritual, Jesus founded, properly speaking, the Christian ministry. For this is precisely the line of demarcation between the simple Christian and the minister, that the former realizes the life of faith in any earthly calling; while the latter, excused by his Master from any particular profession, can devote himself entirely to the spiritual work with which he is intrusted. Such is the new position to which Jesus raises these young fishermen. It is more than simple faith, but less than apostleship; it is the ministry, the general foundation on which will be erected the apostolate.

The call related here by Luke is certainly the same as that which is related, in a more abridged form, by Matthew (4 : 18–22) and Mark (1 : 16–20). For can any one suppose, with Riggenbach, that Jesus twice addressed the same persons in these terms, "I will make you fishers of men," and that they could have twice left all in order to follow Him? If the miraculous draught of fishes is omitted in Matthew and Mark, it is because, as we have frequent proof in the former, in the traditional narratives, the whole interest was centred in the word of Jesus, which was the soul of every incident. Mark has given completeness to these narratives wherever he could avail himself of Peter's accounts. But here this was not the case, because, as many facts go to prove, Peter avoided giving prominence to himself in his own narrations.

Vers. 1-3.* *The General Situation.*—This description furnishes a perfect frame to the scene that follows. The words, *καὶ αὐτός . . . He was also standing there*, indicate the inconvenient position in which He was placed by the crowd collected at this spot. The details in ver. 2 are intended to explain the request which Jesus makes to the fishermen. The night fishing was at an end (ver. 5). And they had no intention of beginning another by daylight; the season was not favorable. Moreover, they had washed their nets (*ἀπέπλυναν* is the true reading; the imperf. in B. D. is a correction), and their boats were drawn up upon the strand (*ἑστῶτα*). If the fishermen had been ready to fish, Jesus would not have asked them to render a service which would have interfered with their work. It is true that Matthew and Mark represent them as actually engaged in casting their nets. But these two evangelists omit the miraculous draught altogether, and take us to the final moment when Jesus says to them: "I will make you fishers of men." Jesus makes a pulpit of the boat which his friends had just left, whence He casts the net of the word over the crowd which covers the shore. Then, desiring to attach henceforth these young believers to Himself with a view to His future work, He determines to give them an emblem they will never forget of the magnificent success that will attend the ministry for the love of which He invites them to forsake all, and in order that it may be more deeply graven on their hearts, He takes this emblem from their daily calling.

Vers. 4–10*a*.† *The Preparation.*—In the imperative, *launch out* (ver. 4), Jesus speaks solely to Peter, as director of the embarkation; the order, *let down*, is addressed to all. Peter, the head of the present fishing, will one day be head also of the mission. Not having taken anything during the night, the most favorable time

* Ver. 1. ℵ. A. B. L. X., *και ακουειν* instead of *του ακουειν*. Ver. 2. B. D., *επλυνον*, instead of *επλυναν* or *απεπλυναν*, which is the reading of all the others.

† Ver. 6. ℵ. B. L. *διερησσετο*, C. *διερρητο*, instead of *διερρηγνυτο* (or *διερηγνυτο*), which is the reading of T. R. and the rest. Ver. 8. ℵ. omits *κυριε*. Ver. 9. B. D. X., *ων* instead of *η*.

for fishing, they had given up the idea of fishing in the day. Peter's reply, so full of docility, indicates faith already existing. "I should not think of letting down the net; nevertheless at Thy word . . ." He calls Jesus ἐπιστάτης, properly *Overseer, Master*. This word frequently occurs in Luke; it is more general than ῥαββί or διδάσκαλος; it refers to any kind of oversight. The miraculous draught may be only a miracle of knowledge; Jesus had a supernatural knowledge of a large shoal of fish to be found in this place. There are numerous instances of a similar abundance of fish appearing in an unexpected way.* Jesus may, however, have wrought by His own will what is frequently produced by physical circumstances. The imperf., *was breaking*, ver. 6, indicates a beginning to break, or at least a danger of it. The arrival of their companions prevented this accident. The term μέτοχοι denotes merely participation in the same employment. In Matthew and Mark, John and James were mending their nets. Luke contains nothing opposed to this. Meyer thinks Peter's astonishment (ver. 8) incomprehensible after all the miracles he had already seen. But whenever divine power leaves the region of the abstract, and comes before our eyes in the sphere of actual facts, does it not appear new? Thus, in Peter's case, the emotion produced by the draught of fishes effaces for the time every other impression. Ἐξελθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. *Go out* [of the boat, and depart] *from me*. Peter here employs the more religious expression *Lord*, which answers to his actual feeling. The word ἀνήρ, *a man*, strongly individualizes the idea of sinner. If the reading ᾗ be preferred to ὢν (Alex.), we must take the word ἄγρα, *catch*, in the passive sense. The term κοινωνοί, *associates* (ver. 10), implies more than μετοχοι, companions (ver. 7); it denotes association in a common undertaking.

Vers. 10*b*, 11.† *The Call.*—In Matthew and Mark the call is addressed to the four disciples present; in Luke, in express terms, to Peter only. It results, doubtless, from what follows that the call of the other disciples was implied (comp. *launch out*, ver. 4), or that Jesus extended it to them, perhaps by a gesture. But how can criticism, with this passage before them, which brings the person of Peter into such prominence, while the other two Syn. do not in any way, attribute to our evangelist an intention to underrate this apostle?‡

The analytical form ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν, *thou shalt be catching*, expresses the permanence of this mission; and the words, *from henceforth*, its altogether new character. Just as the fisherman, by his superior intelligence, makes the fish fall into his snares, so the believer, restored to God and to himself, may seize hold of the natural man, and lift it up with himself to God.

* Tristram, "The Natural History of the Bible," p. 285: "The thickness of the shoals of fish in the lake of Gennesareth is almost incredible to any one who has not witnessed them. They often cover an area of more than an acre; and when the fish move slowly forward in a mass, and are rising out of the water, they are packed so close together that it appears as if a heavy rain was beating down on the surface of the water." A similar phenomenon was observed some years ago, and even in the spring of this year, in several of our Swiss lakes. "At the end of February, in the lakes of Constance and Wallentsadt, the fish crowded together in such large numbers at certain places by the banks, that the water was darkened by them. At a single draught, 35 quintals of different kinds of fish were taken."—(*Bund*, 6th March, 1872.)

† Ver. 11. ℵ. B. D. L., παντα instead of απαντα.

‡ "Luke underrates Peter," says M. Burnouf, following M. de Bunsen, jun., *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, 1st December, 1865. Is it not time to have done with this bitter and untruthful criticism, of which the "Anonymous Saxon" has given the most notorious example, and which belongs to a phase of science now passed away?

This whole scene implies certain previous relations between Jesus and these young men (ver. 5), which agrees with Luke's narrative; for in the latter this incident is placed after the healing of Peter's mother-in-law, when the newly called disciples were present. We must go farther back even than this; for how could Jesus have entered into Peter's house on the Sabbath day (4 : 38), unless they had already been intimately acquainted? John's narrative easily explains all: Jesus had made the acquaintance of Peter and his friends when they were with John the Baptist (John 1). As for Matthew and Mark, their narrative has just the fragmentary character that belongs to the traditional narrative. The facts are simply put into juxtaposition. Beyond this, each writer follows his own bent: Matthew is eager after the words of Christ, which in his view are the essential thing; Mark dwells somewhat more on the circumstances; Luke enriches the traditional narrative by the addition of an important detail—the miraculous fishing—obtained from private sources of information. His narrative is so simple, and at the same time so picturesque, that its accuracy is beyond suspicion. John does not mention this incident, because it was already sufficiently known through the tradition; but, in accordance with his method, he places before us the first commencement of the connection which terminated in this result. Holtzmann thinks that Luke's narrative is made up partly from that of Mark and Matthew, and partly from the account of the miraculous fishing related in John 21. It would be well to explain how, if this were the case, the thrice repeated reply of Peter, *Thou knowest that I love Thee*, could have been changed by Luke into the exclamation, *Depart from me!* Is it not much more simple to admit that, when Jesus desired to restore Peter to his apostleship, after the denial, He began by placing him in a similar situation to that in which he was when first called, in the presence of another miraculous draught of fishes; and that it was by awakening in him the fresh impressions of earlier days that He restored to him his ministry? Besides, in John 21, the words, *on the other side of the ship*, seem to allude to the mission to the heathen.

The course of events therefore was this: Jesus, after having attached to Himself in Judæa these few disciples of John the Baptist, took them back with Him into Galilee; and as He wished Himself to return to His own family for a little while (John 2 : 1–12; Matt. 4 : 13), He sent them back to theirs, where they resumed their former employments. In this way those early days passed away, spent in Capernaum and the neighborhood, of which John speaks (οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας), and which Luke describes from 4 : 14. But when the time came for Him to go to Jerusalem for the feast of the Passover (John 2 : 13 *et seq.*), where Jesus determined to perform the solemn act which was to inaugurate His Messianic ministry (John 2 : 13 *et seq.*), He thought that the hour had come to attach them to Him altogether; so, separating Himself finally from His family circle and early calling, He required the same sacrifice from them. For this they were sufficiently prepared by all their previous experiences; they made it therefore without hesitation, and we find them from this time constantly with Him, both in the narrative of John (2 : 17, 4 : 2–8) and in the Synoptics.

2. The Lepers: vers. 12–14.* In Mark (1 : 40), as in Luke, the cure of the lepers took place during a preaching tour. Matthew connects this miracle with the Sermon on the Mount; it is as He comes down from the hill that Jesus meets and heals the leper (8 : 1 *et seq.*). This latter detail is so precise that it is natural to give Matthew the preference here, rather than say, with Holtzmann, that Matthew wanted to fill up the return from the mountain to the city with it.

Leprosy was in every point of view a most frightful malady. *First.* In its physical aspects it was a whitish pustule, eating away the flesh, attacking member after member, and at last eating away the very bones; it was attended with burning fever, sleeplessness, and nightmare, without scarcely the slightest hope of cure. Such were its physical characteristics; it was a living death. *Second.* In the social point of view, in consequence of the excessively contagious nature of his malady, the leper

* Ver. 13. The MSS. are divided between ειπων and λεγων (Alex.).

was separated from his family, and from intercourse with men, and had no other company than that of others as unhappy as himself. Lepers ordinarily lived in bands, at a certain distance from human habitations (2 Kings 7 : 3 ; Luke 17 : 12). Their food was deposited for them in convenient places. They went with their head uncovered, and their chin wrapped up ; and on the approach of any persons whom they met, they had to announce themselves as lepers. *Third.* In the religious point of view, the leper was Levitically unclean, and consequently excommunicate. His malady was considered a direct chastisement from God. In the very rare case of a cure, he was only restored to the theocratic community on an official declaration of the priest, and after offering the sacrifice prescribed by the law (Lev. 13 and 14, and the tract Negaïm in the Talmud).

The Greek expression is : *And behold, a man!* There is not a verb even. His approach was not seen ; it has all the effect of an apparition. This dramatic form reproduces the impression made on those who witnessed the scene ; in fact, it was only by a kind of surprise, and as it were by stealth, that a leper could have succeeded in approaching so near. The construction of the 12th verse (*καὶ ἐγένετο . . . καὶ . . . καὶ*) is Hebraistic, and proves an Aramæan document. There is nothing like it in the other Syn. ; the eye-witness discovers himself in every feature of Luke's narrative. The diseased man was *full of leprosy*—that is to say, his countenance was lividly white, as is the case when the malady has reached an advanced stage. The unhappy man looks for Jesus in the crowd, and *having discovered Him* (*ἰδών*) he rushes toward Him ; the moment he recognizes Him, he is at His feet. Luke says, *falling on his face ;* Mark, *kneeling down ;* Matthew, *he worshipped.* Would not these variations in terms be puerile if this were a case of copying, or of a derivation from a common source ? The dialogue is identical in the three narratives ; it was expressed in the tradition in a fixed form, while the historical details were reproduced with greater freedom. All three evangelists say *cleanse* instead of *heal*, on account of the notion of uncleanness attached to this malady. In the words, *if Thou wilt, Thou canst*, there is at once deep anguish and great faith. Other sick persons had been cured—this the leper knew—hence his faith ; but he was probably the first man afflicted with his particular malady that succeeded in reaching Jesus and entreating His aid—hence his anxiety. The older rationalism used to explain this request in this way : "Thou canst, as Messiah, pronounce me clean." According to this explanation, the diseased person, already in the way of being cured naturally, simply asked Jesus to verify the cure and pronounce him clean, in order that he might be spared a costly and troublesome journey to Jerusalem. But for the term *καθαρίζειν, to purify*, comp. 7 : 22, Matt. 10 : 8, where the simply declarative sense is impossible ; and as to the context, Strauss has already shown that it comports just as little with this feeble meaning. After the words, *be thou clean* (pronounced pure), these, *and he was cleansed* (pronounced pure), would be nothing but absurd tautology. Mark, who takes pleasure in portraying the feelings of Jesus, expresses the deep compassion with which He was moved by this spectacle (*σπλαγχνισθείς*). The three narratives concur in one detail, which must have deeply impressed those who saw it, and which, for this reason, was indelibly imprinted on the tradition : *He put forth His hand, and touched him.* Leprosy was so contagious,* that this cour-

* It probably was regarded as contagious in popular apprehension, which would justify the remark in the text ; but the man who was so completely covered with the

ageous act excited the liveliest emotion in the crowd. Throughout the whole course of His life, Jesus confronted the touch of our impure nature in a similar manner. His answer is identical in the three narratives; but the result is variously expressed. Matthew says: *his leprosy was cleansed*, regarding it from a ceremonial point of view. Luke simply says: *the leprosy departed from him*, looking at it from a human point of view. Mark combines the two forms. This is one of the passages on which they rely who make Mark a compiler from the other two; but if Mark was anxious to adhere so slavishly to the minutest expressions of his predecessors, to the point even of reproducing them without any object, how are we to explain the serious and important modifications which in so many other cases he introduced into their narratives, and the considerable omissions which he is continually making of the substance of what they relate? The fact is, that there were two sides to this cure, as to the malady itself, the physical and the religious; and Mark combines them, while the other two appear to take one or the other.

The prohibition which Jesus lays on the leper appears in Luke 5 : 14 in the form of indirect discourse; but in relating the injunction which follows it, Luke passes to the direct form. This form is peculiar to his narrative. Luke and Matthew omit the threat with which Jesus, according to Mark, accompanied this injunction (ἐμβριμησάμενος). What was the intention of Jesus? The cure having been public, He could not prevent the report of it from being spread abroad. This is true; but He wanted to do all in His power to diminish its fame, and not give a useless impetus to the popular excitement produced by the report of His miracles. Comp. Luke 8 : 56; Matt. 9 : 30, 12 : 16; Mark 1 : 34, 3 : 12, 5 : 43, 7 : 36, 8 : 26. All these passages forbid our seeking a particular cause for the prohibition He lays on the leper; such as a fear that the priests, having had notice of his cure before his reaching them, would refuse to acknowledge it; or that they would pronounce Jesus unclean for having touched him; or that the sick man would lose the serious impressions which he had received; or that he would allow himself to be deterred from the duty of offering the sacrifice. Jesus said, "Show thyself," because the person is here the convincing proof. In Luke we read, *according to Moses* . . . in Matthew, *the gift which Moses* . . . in Mark, *the things which Moses* . . . Most puerile changes, if they were designed! What is the testimony contained in this sacrifice, and to whom is it addressed? According to Bleek, the word *them* would refer to the people, who are to be apprised that every one may henceforth renew his former relations with the lep. But is not the term *testimony* too weighty for this meaning? Gerlach refers the pronoun *them* to the priests: in order that thou, by thy cure, mayest be a witness to them of my almightiness; but according to the text, the testimony consists not in the cure being verified, but in the sacrifice being offered. The word *them* does indeed refer to the priests, who are all represented by the one who will verify the cure; but the testimony respects Jesus Himself, and His sentiments in regard to the law. In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus repels the charge already preferred against Him of despising the law (Matt. 5 : 17: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law"). It is to His respect, therefore, for the Mosaic legislation, that this offering will testify to the priests. During His earthly career Jesus never dispensed His people from the obligation to obey the prescriptions of the law; and it is an error to

disease that it could find no further range was clean, according to Lev. 13 : 13. See Smith's Dict. of Bible, *sub voce*.—Tr.

regard Him as having, under certain circumstances, set aside the law of the Sabbath as far as He Himself was concerned. He only transgressed the arbitrary enactments with which Pharisaism had surrounded it. We see by these remarkable words that Jesus had already become an object of suspicion and serious charges at Jerusalem. This state of things is explained by the narrative of the fourth Gospel, where, from the second chapter, we see Jesus exposed to the animosity of the dominant party, and accords to 4 : 1. He is even obliged to leave Judæa in order that their unfavorable impressions may not be aggravated before the time. In chap. 5, which describes a fresh visit to Jerusalem (for the feast of Purim), the conflict thus prepared breaks forth with violence, and Jesus is obliged to testify solemnly His respect for this Moses, who will be the Jews' accuser, and not His (5 : 45–47). This is just the state of things with which the passage we are explaining agrees, as well as all the facts which are the sequel of it. Notwithstanding apparent discrepancies between the Syn. and John, a substantial similarity prevails between them, which proves that both forms of narrative rest on a basis of historic reality.

The leper, according to Mark, did not obey the injunction of Jesus ; and this disobedience served to increase that concourse of sick persons which Jesus endeavored to lessen.

This cure is a difficulty for Keim. A purely moral influence may calm a fever (4 : 39), or restore a frenzied man to his senses (4 . 31 *et seq.*) ; but it cannot purify vitiated blood, and cleanse a body covered with pustules. Keim here resorts to what is substantially the explanation of Paulus The leper already cured simply desired to be pronounced clean by authorized lips, that he might not have to go to Jerusalem. It must be acknowledged, on this view of the matter, that the three narratives (Matthew as well as Luke and Mark, whatever Keim may say about it) are completely falsified by the legend. Then how came it to enter into the mind of this man to substitute Jesus for a priest? How could Jesus have accepted such an office? Having accepted it, why should He have sent the afflicted man to Jerusalem? Further, for what reason did He impose silence upon him, and enforce it with threats? And what could the man have had to publish abroad, of sufficient importance to attract the crowd of people described Mark 1 : 45?

Holtzmann (p 432) concludes, from the words ἐξέβαλεν and ἐξελθών, literally, *He cast him out*, and *having gone forth* (Mark 1 : 43, 45), that according to Mark this cure took place in a house, which agrees very well with the leper being prohibited from making it known ; and that consequently the other two Syn. are in error in making it take place in public—Luke in a city, Matthew on the road from the mountain to Capernaum (8 . 1). He draws great exegetical inferences from this. But when it is said in Mark (1 : 12) that the Spirit *drove out* (ἐκβάλλει) Jesus into the wilderness, does this mean out of a house? And as to the verb ἐξέρχεσθαι, is it not frequently used in a broad sense : to go out of the midst of that in which one happens to be (here : the circle formed around Jesus)? Comp. Mark 6 : 34 (Matt. 14 : 14), 6 : 12 ; John 1 : 44, etc. A leper would hardly have been able to make his way into a house. His taking them by surprise in the way he did could scarcely have happened except in the open country ; and, as we have seen, the prohibition of Jesus can easily be explained, taking this view of the incident. The critical consequences of Holtzmann, therefore, have no substantial basis.

3. *The Paralytic :* vers. 15–26.—*First.* A general description of the state of the work, vers. 15, 16 ; *Second.* The cure of the paralytic, vers. 17–26.

First. Vers. 15 and 16.* While seeking to calm the excitement produced by His miracles, Jesus endeavored also to preserve His energies from any spiritual deteriora-

* ℵ. B. C. D. L. some Mnn. It. omit *υπ' αυτου.*

tion by devoting part of His time to meditation and prayer. As Son of man, He had, in common with us all, to draw from God the strength He needed for His hours of activity. Such touches as these in the narrative certainly do not look like an apotheosis of Jesus, and they constitute a striking difference between the evangelical portrait and the legendary caricature. This thoroughly original detail suffices also to prove the independence of Luke's sources of information. After this general description (the seventh), the narrative is resumed with a detached and special incident, given as an example of the state of things described.

Second. Vers. 17–19.* *The Arrival.*—The completely Aramæan form of this preface (the καί before αὐτός, the form καὶ ἦσαν . . . οἱ ἦσαν, and especially the expression ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι) proves that Luke's account is not borrowed from either of the two other Synoptics. This was one of those solemn hours of which we have another instance in the evening at Capernaum (4 : 41, 42). The presence of the Pharisees and scribes from Jerusalem is easily explained, if the conflict related John 5 had already taken place. The scribes did not constitute a theological or political party, like the Pharisees and Sadducees. They were the professional lawyers. They were designedly associated with the Pharisees sent to Galilee to watch Jesus (ver. 21). The narrative in the first Gospel is extremely concise. Matthew does not tell the story ; he is intent upon his object, the word of Jesus. Mark gives the same details as Luke, but without the two narratives presenting one single term in common. And yet they worked on the same document, or one on the text of the other ! The roof of the house could be reached by a flight of steps outside built against the wall, or by a ladder, or even from the next house, for the houses frequently communicated with each other by the terraces. Does Luke's expression, διὰ τῶν κεράμων, signify simply *by the roof*—that is to say, by the stairs which conducted from the terrace to the lower stories, or down over the balustrade which surrounded the terrace ; or is it just equivalent to Mark's description : " they uncovered the ceiling of the place where He was, and having made an opening, let down the pallet " ? This term, *through the tiles*, would be strange, if it was not to express an idea similar to that of Mark. Strauss objects that such an operation as that of raising the tiles could not have been effected without danger to those who were below ; and he concludes from this that the narrative is only a legend. But in any case, a legend would have been invented in conformity with the mode of construction then adopted and known to everybody. Jesus was probably seated in a hall immediately beneath the terrace.†

Vers. 20 and 21.‡ *The Offence.*—The expression *their faith*, in Luke, applies evidently to the perseverance of the sick man and his bearers, notwithstanding the obstacles they encountered ; it is the same in Mark. In Matthew, who has not men-

* Ver. 17. ℵ. B. L. Z., αυτον instead of αυτους. Ver. 19. All the Mjj. omit δια before ποιας.

† Delitzsch represents the fact in this way (" Ein Tag in Capernaum," pp. 40–46) : Two bearers ascend the roof by a ladder, and by means of cords they draw up by the same way the sick man after them, assisted by the other two bearers. In the middle of the terrace was a square place open in summer to give light and air to the house, but closed with tiles during the rainy season. Having opened this passage, the bearers let down the sick man into the large inner court immediately below, where Jesus was teaching near the cistern, fixed as usual in this court. The trap-stairs which lead down from the terrace into the house would have been too narrow for their use, and would not have taken them into the court, but into the apartments which overlooked it from all sides.

‡ Ver. 20 ℵ. B. L. X. omit αυτω after ειπεν.

tioned these obstacles, but who nevertheless employs the same terms, *and seeing their faith*, this expression can only refer to the simple fact of the paralytic's coming. The identical form of expression indicates a common source ; but at the same time, the different sense put upon the common words by their entirely different reference to what precedes proves that this source was not written. The oral tradition had evidently so stereotyped this form of expression that it is found in the narrative of Matthew, though separated from the circumstances to which it is applied in the two others. Jesus could not repel such an act of faith. Seeing the persevering confidence of the sick man, recognizing in him one of those whom *His Father draws to Him* (John 6 : 44), He receives him with open arms, by telling him that he is forgiven. The three salutations differ in our Syn. : *Man* (Luke) ; *My son* (Mark), *Take courage, my Son* (Matthew). Which of the evangelists was it that changed in this arbitrary and aimless manner the words of Jesus as recorded in his predecessor ? * Ἀφέωνται is an Attic form, either for the present ἀφίενται, or rather for the perf. ἀφεῖνται. It is not impossible that, by speaking in this way, Jesus intended to throw down the gauntlet to His inquisitors. They took it up. The scribes are put before the Pharisees ; they were the experts. A blasphemy ! How welcome to them ! Nothing could have sounded more agreeably in their ears. We will not say, in regard to this accusation, with many orthodox interpreters, that, as God, Jesus had a right to pardon ; for this would be to go directly contrary to the employment of the title *Son of man*, in virtue of which Jesus attributes to Himself, in ver. 24, this power. But may not God delegate His gracious authority to a man who deserves His confidence, and who becomes, for the great work of salvation, His ambassador on earth ? This is the position which Jesus takes. The only question is, whether this pretension is well founded ; and it is the demonstration of this moral fact, already contained in His previous miracles, that He proceeds to give in a striking form to His adversaries.

Vers. 22–24.† *The Miracle.*—The miraculous work which is to follow is for a moment deferred. Jesus, without having heard the words of those about Him, understands their murmurs. His mind is, as it were, the mirror of their thoughts. The form of His reply is so striking that the tradition has preserved it to the very letter ; hence it is found in identical terms in all three narratives. The proposition, *that ye may know*, depends on the following command : *I say to thee* . . . The principal and subordinate clauses having been separated by a moment of solemn silence the three accounts fill up this interval with the parenthesis : *He saith to the paralytic.* This original and identical form must necessarily proceed from a common source, oral or written. It is no easier, certainly, to pardon than to heal ; but it is much easier to convict a man of imposture who falsely claims the power to heal, than him who falsely arrogates authority to pardon. There is a slight irony in the way in which Jesus gives expression to this thought. "You think these are empty words that I utter when I say, Thy sins are forgiven thee. See, then, whether the command which I am about to give is an empty word." The miracle thus announced acquires the value of an imposing demonstration. It will be seen whether Jesus is not really what He claims to be, the Ambassador of God on earth to forgive sins. Earth, where the pardon is granted, is opposed to heaven, where He dwells from whom it proceeds.

* Our author means by this and many similar expressions, to disprove the idea of the Gospels being copied from one another.—J. H.

† The MSS. vary between παραλελυμενω and παραλυτικω.

It is generally acknowledged at the present day, that the title *Son of man*, by which Jesus preferred to designate Himself, is not simply an allusion to the symbolical name in Dan. 7, but that it sprang spontaneously from the depths of Jesus' own consciousness. Just as, in His title of *Son of God*, Jesus included whatever He was conscious of being for God, so in that of *Son of man* He comprehended all He felt He was for men. The term *Son of man* is generic, and denotes each representative of the human race (Ps. 8 : 5 ; Ezek. 37 : 3, 9, 11). With the art. (*the* Son of man), this expression contains the notion of a superiority in the equality. It designates Jesus not simply as man, but as the normal man, the perfect representative of the race. If this title alludes to any passage of the O. T., it must be to the ancient prophecy, "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head" (Gen. 3 : 15).* There is a tone of triumph in this expression, ver. 25 : *He took up that whereon he lay.* The astonishment of the people, ver. 26, is expressed differently in the three narratives : *We never saw it on this fashion* (Mark) ; *They glorified God, which had given such power unto men* (Matthew). This remarkable expression, *to men*, is doubtless connected with *Son of man*. Whatever is given to the normal man, is in Him given to all. Matthew did not certainly add this expression on his own authority, any more than the others arbitrarily omitted it. Their sources were different.

Παράδοξα, *strange things*, in Luke, is found in Josephus' account of Jesus. By the term *to-day* the multitude allude not only to the miracle—they had seen others as astounding on previous days—but more particularly to the divine prerogative of pardon, so magnificently demonstrated by this miracle with which Jesus had just connected it. The different expressions by which the crowd give utterance to their surprise in the three Syn. might really have been on the lips of different witnesses of this scene.

Keim, applying here the method indicated, pp. 162–3, thinks that the paralysis was overcome by the moral excitement which the sick man underwent. Examples are given of impotent persons whose power of movement has been restored by a mighty internal shock. Therefore it is just possible that the physical fact might be explained in this way. But the moral fact, the absolute assurance of Jesus, the challenge implied in this address, "In order that ye may know, . . . arise and walk!"—a speech the authenticity of which is so completely guaranteed by the three narratives and by its evident originality—how is this to be explained from Keim's standpoint? Why, Jesus, in announcing so positively a success so problematical, would have laid Himself open to be palpably contradicted by the fact! At the commencement of His ministry He would have based His title to be the Son of man, His authority to forgive sins, His mission as the Saviour, His entire spiritual work, on the needle's point of this hazardous experiment! If this were the case, instead of a divine demonstration (and this is the meaning which Jesus attaches to the miracle), there would be nothing more in the fact than a fortunate coincidence.

4. *The Call of Levi :* vers. 27–39.—This section relates : *First.* The call of Levi ; *Second.* The feast which followed, with the discourse connected with it ; *Third.* A double lesson arising out of a question about fasting.

* M. Gess, in his fine work, "Christi Zeugniss von seiner Person und seinem Werk," 1870, understands by *the Son of man*, He who represents the divine majesty in a human form. The idea in itself is true ; the normal man is called to share in the divine estate, and to become the supreme manifestation of God. But the notion of divine majesty does not belong to the term *Son of man*. It is contained in the term *Son of God*. The two titles are in antithetical connection, and for this reason they complete each other.

First. Vers. 27 and 28.* *The Call.*—This fact occupies an important place in the development of the work of Jesus, not only as the complement of the call of the first disciples (ver. 1 *et seq*), but especially as a continuation of the conflict already entered into with the old order of things.

The publicans of the Gospels are ordinarily regarded as Jewish sub-collectors in the service of Rome knights, to whom the tolls of Palestine had been let out at Rome. Wieseler, in his recent work,† corrects this view. He proves, by an edict of Cæsar, quoted in Josephus (" Antiq." xiv. 10. 5), that the tolls in Judæa were remitted direct to the Jewish or heathen collectors, without passing through the hands of the Roman financiers. The publicans, especially such as, like Matthew, were of Jewish origin, were hated and despised by their fellow-countrymen more even than the heathen themselves. They were excommunicated, and deprived of the right of tendering an oath before the Jewish authorities. Their conduct, which was too often marked by extortion and fraud, generally justified the opprobrium which public opinion cast upon them. Capernaum was on the road leading from Damascus to the Mediterranean, which terminated at Ptolemais (St. Jean d'Acre). It was the commercial highway from the interior of Asia. In this city, therefore, there must have been a tax-office of considerable importance. This office was probably situated outside the city, and near the sea. This explains the expression, *He went out* (Luke) ; *He went forth in order to go to the sea-side* (Mark). In the three Syn. this call immediately follows the healing of the paralytic (Matt. 9 : 9 ; Mark 2 : 13 *et seq.*).

Jesus must have had some very important reason for calling a man from the class of the publicans to join the circle of His disciples ; for by this step He set Himself at open variance with the theocratic notions of decorum. Was it His deliberate intention to throw down the gauntlet to the numerous Pharisees who had come from a distance to watch Him, and to show them how completely He set Himself above their judgment ? Or was it simply convenient to have among His disciples a man accustomed to the use of the pen ? This is quite possible ; but there is something so abrupt, so spontaneous, and so strange in this call that it is impossible to doubt that Jesus spoke to him in obedience to a direct impulse from on high. The higher nature of the call appears also in the decision and promptness with which it was accepted. Between Jesus and this man there must have been, as it were, a flash of divine sympathy. The relation between Jesus and His first apostles was formed in this way (John 1). The name Levi not occurring in any of the lists of apostles—it is impossible to identify it with Lebbæus, which has a different meaning and etymology—it might be thought that this Levi never belonged to the number of the Twelve. But in this case why should his call be so particularly related ? Then the expression, *having left all, he followed Him* (ver. 28), forbids our thinking that Levi ever resumed his profession as a toll-collector, and puts him in the same rank as the four older disciples (ver. 11). We must therefore look for him among the apostles. In the catalogue of the first Gospel (10 : 3), the Apostle Matthew is called the publican ; and in the same Gospel (9 : 9) the call of Matthew the publican is related, with details identical with those of our narrative. Must we admit two different but similar incidents ? This was the supposition of the Gnostic Heracleon and of Clement of Alexandria. Sieffert, Ewald, and Keim prefer to admit that our first Gospel applies

* Ver. 28. Th emss. vary between καταλιπων and καταλειπων, as well as between απαντα and παντα, ηκολουθει and ηκολουθησεν.

† " Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien," p. 78.

by mistake to the apostle and older publican Matthew, the calling of another less known publican, who should be called Levi (Mark and Luke). This opinion naturally implies that the first Gospel is unauthentic. But is it not much simpler to suppose that the former name of this man was Levi, and that Jesus, perceiving the direct hand of God in this event, gave him the surname of Matthew, gift of God, just as He gave Simon, at His first meeting with him, the surname of Peter?* This name, which Matthew habitually bore in the Church, was naturally that under which he figured afterward in the catalogues of the apostles.† Were Luke and Mark unaware that the apostle so named was the publican whom they had designated by the name of Levi? Or have they neglected to mention this identity in their lists of the apostles, because they have given these just as they found them in their documents? We do not know. We are continually struck by seeing how the evangelical tradition has left in the shade the secondary personages of this great drama, in order to bestow exclusive attention on the principal actor. Ἐθεάσατο does not signify merely *He saw*, but *He fixed His eyes upon him.* This was the moment when something peculiar and inexplicable took place between Jesus and the publican. The expression καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον cannot signify seated *in* the office; ἐπὶ or ἐν τῷ τελωνιῷ would be necessary. As the accusative after ἐπί, the word *toll* might mean, seated at his work of toll collecting; but this sense of τελώνιον is unexampled. Might not the prep. ἐπί have the sense here in which it is sometimes employed in the classics—in Herodotus, for example, when he says of Aristides that he kept ἐπὶ τὸ συνέδριον in front of the place where the chiefs were assembled (8:79)? Levi must have been seated in front of his office, observing what was passing. How, indeed, if he had been seated *in* the office, could his glance have met that of Jesus? Without even re-entering, he follows Him, forsaking all.

Second. Vers. 29–32.‡ *The Feast.*—According to Luke, the repast was spread in the house of Levi; the new disciple seeks to bring his old friends and Jesus together. It is his first missionary effort. Meyer sees a contradiction to Matthew here. Matthew says, "as Jesus sat at meat in the house"—an expression which, in his opinion, can only mean the dwelling of Jesus. He decides in favor of Matthew's narrative. But (1) how came the crowd of publicans and people of ill-fame at meat all at once in the house of Jesus? (2) Where is there ever any mention of *the house of Jesus?* (3) The repetition of Jesus' name at the end of the verse (ver. 10 in Matthew) excludes the idea that the complement understood of *the house* is *Jesus.* As to Mark, the pron. αὐτοῦ, *his* house, refers to Levi; this is proved (1) by the opposition of αὐτοῦ to the preceding αὐτόν, and (2) by the repetition of the name Ἰησοῦ in the following phrase. § The expression *in the house*, in Matthew, denotes therefore the house, wherever it was, in which the meal took place, in opposition to the outside, where the call, with the preaching that followed it, occurred. As usual, Matthew passes

* Comp. the Ματθαῖον λεγόμενον, Matt. 9:9, with Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος, 10:2. —John 1:43.

† In the opinion of Gesenius, the name Matthias is a contraction of the Hebrew Mattathias, *gift of God*, but the opinion is not universally accepted. The conclusion, however, of our author is generally received.—J. H.

‡ Part of the MSS. put οἱ Φαρισαιοι before οἱ γραμματεις αυτων; T. R., with the others, οἱ γραμμ. αυτων before οἱ Φαρισ. Αυτον is omitted by ℵ. D. F. X. some Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$; T. R. omits των, with S. V. Π. only.

§ I am happy to find myself in accord here with Klostermann in his fine and conscientious study of the second Gospel. ("Das Marcus-Evangelium," pp. 43, 44.)

rapidly over the external circumstances of the narrative ; it is the word of Jesus in which he is interested. The repast, doubtless, took place on the ground-floor, and the apartment or gallery in which the table was spread could easily be reached from the street. While Jesus was surrounded by His new friends, His adversaries attacked His disciples. The T. R. places *their scribes* before *the Pharisees*. In this case they would be the scribes of the place, or those of the nation. Neither meaning is very natural ; the other reading, therefore, must be preferred : *the Pharisees and their scribes*, the defenders of strict observance, and the learned men sent with them from Jerusalem as experts (vers. 17–21). The Sinait. and some others have omitted αὐτῶν, doubtless on account of the difficulty and apparent uselessness of this pronoun.

Eating together is, in the East, as with us, the sign of very close intimacy. Jesus, therefore, went beyond all the limits of Jewish decorum in accepting the hospitality of Matthew's house, and in such company. His justification is partly serious and partly ironical. He seems to concede to the Pharisees that they are perfectly well, and concludes from this that for them He, the physician, is useless ; so far the irony. On the other hand, it is certain that, speaking ritually, the Pharisees were right according to the Levitical law, and that being so, they would enjoy the means of grace offered by the old covenant, of which those who have broken with the theocratic forms are deprived. In this sense the latter are really in a more serious condition than the Pharisees, and more urgently need that some one should interest himself in their salvation ; this is the serious side of the answer. This word is like a two-edged sword : first of all, it justifies Jesus from His adversaries' point of view, and by an argument *ad hominem ;* but, at the same time, it is calculated to excite serious doubts in their minds as to whether this point of view be altogether just, and to give them a glimpse of another, according to which the difference that separates them from the publicans has not all the worth which they attributed to it (see on 15 : 1–7). The words *to repentance* are wanting in Matthew and Mark, according to the best authorities ; the words understood in this case are : to the kingdom of God, to salvation. In Luke, where these words are authentic, they continue the irony which forms the substance of this answer : come to call *to repentance just persons !* It is for the Pharisees to ask themselves, after this, whether, because they meet the requirements of the temple, they satisfy the demands of God. The discussion here takes a new turn ; it assumes the character of a conversation on the use of fasting in the old and new order of things.

Third. Vers. 33–39. *Instruction concerning Fasting.*

Vers 33–35.* In Luke they are the same parties, particularly the scribes, who continue the conversation, and who allege, in favor of the regular practice of fasting, the example of the disciples of John and of the Pharisees. The scribes express themselves in this manner, because they themselves, as scribes, belong to no party whatever. In Matthew it is the disciples of John who appear all at once in the midst of this scene, and interrogate Jesus in their own name and in that of the Pharisees. In Mark it is the disciples of John and of the Pharisees united who put the question. This difference might easily find its way into the oral tradition, but it

* Ver. 33. ℵ[a] (?) B. L. X. omit διατι. Ver. 34. ℵ* D. It[plerique], μη δυνανται οι υιοι . . . νηστευσαι (or νηστευειν) instead of μη δυνασθε τους υιους . . . ποιησαι νηστευσαι (or νηστευειν). Ver. 35. ℵ. C. F. L. M. some Mnn. Syr. It[plerique], omit και before οταν. The same (with the exception of C. L.) and Δ. place it before τοτε.

is inexplicable on any of the hypotheses which deduce the three texts from one and the same written source, or one of them from another. Mark says literally . *the disciples of John and the Pharisees were fasting;* and we may understand *that day.* Devout persons in Israel fasted, in fact, twice a week (Luke 18 : 12), on Mondays and Fridays, the days on which it was said that Moses went up Sinai (see Meyer on Matt. 6 : 16) ; this particular day may have been one or other of these two days. But we may also explain it : *fasted habitually.* They were fasting persons, addicted to religious observances in which fasting held an important place. It is not easy to decide between these two senses : with the first, there seems less reason for the question ; with the second, it conveys a much more serious charge against Jesus, since it refers to His habitual conduct ; comp. 7 : 34, " Ye say, He is a glutton and a winebibber (an eater and a drinker)." The word *διατί*, omitted by the Alex., appears to have been taken from Matthew and Mark.

Whether the disciples of John were present or not, it is to their mode of religious reformation that our Lord's answer more especially applies. As they do not appear to have cherished very kindly feelings toward Jesus (John 3 : 25, 26), it is very possible that they were united on this occasion with His avowed adversaries (Matthew). Jesus compares the days of His presence on the earth to a nuptial feast. The Old Testament had represented the Messianic coming of Jehovah by this figure. If John the Baptist had already uttered the words reported by John (3 : 29) : ' He that hath the bride is the bridegroom ; but the friend of the bridegroom, which standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice : this my joy therefore is fulfilled "—what appropriateness there was in this figure by which He replied to His disciples ! Perhaps the Pharisees authorized a departure from the rule respecting fasting during the nuptial weeks. In this case Jesus' reply would become more striking still. Νυμφών signifies *the nuptial chamber*, and not the *bridegroom* (νυμφίος), as Martin, Ostervald, and Crampon translate. The true Greek term to indicate the nuptial friend would have been παρανύμφιος ; John says : φίλος τοῦ νυμφίου. The expression of the Syn., *son of the nuptial chamber*, is a Hebraism (comp. son of the kingdom, of wisdom, of perdition, etc.). The received reading, " Can you make the marriage friends fast ?" (notwithstanding the joy with which their hearts are full), is preferable to that of the Sinait. and of the Græco-Latin Codd , " Can they fast ?" which is less forcible, and which is taken from Matthew and Mark. In the midst of this feast of publicans the heart of Jesus is overflowing with joy ; it is one of the hours when His earthly life seems to His feeling like a marriage day. But suddenly His countenance becomes overcast ; the shadow of a painful vision passes across His brow : *The days will come* . . . said He in a solemn tone. At the close of this nuptial week the bridegroom Himself will be suddenly smitten and cut off ; then will come the time of fasting for those who to-day are rejoicing ; there will be no necessity to enjoin it. In this striking and poetic answer Jesus evidently announces His violent death. The passive aor. cannot, as Bleek admits, be explained otherwise. This verb and tense indicate a stroke of violence, by which the subject of the verb will be smitten (comp. 1 Cor. 5 : 2). This saying is parallel to the words found in John 2 : 19, ' Destroy this temple ;" and 3 : 14, " As Moses lifted up the serpent, so must the Son of man be lifted up " The fasting which Jesus here opposes to the prescribed fasting practised in Israel is neither a state of purely inward grief, a moral fast, in moments of spiritual depression, nor, as Neander thought, the life of privation and sacrifice to which the apostles would inevitably be exposed after

the departure of their Master ; it is indeed, according to the context, fasting in the proper sense of the term. Fasting has always been practised in the Church at certain solemn seasons, but it is not a rite imposed on it from without, but the expression of a sentiment of real grief. It proceeds from the sorrow which the Church feels in the absence of its Head, and is designed to lend intensity to its prayers, and to insure with greater certainty that assistance of Jesus which alone can supply the place of His visible presence (comp. Mark 9 : 29 (?) ; Acts 12 : 2, 3 ; 14 : 23). This remarkable saying was preserved with literal exactness in the tradition ; accordingly we find it in identical words in the three Syn. It proves, first, that from the earliest period of His ministry Jesus regarded Himself as the Messiah ; next, that He identified His coming with that of Jehovah, the husband of Israel and of mankind (Hos. 3 : 19) ; * lastly, that at that time He already foresaw and announced His violent death. It is an error, therefore, to oppose, on these three points, the fourth Gospel to the other three.

Vers. 36-39. Here we have the second part of the conversation. The expression *ἔλεγε δὲ καί, and He said also*, indicates its range. This expression, which occurs so frequently in Luke, always indicates the point at which Jesus, after having treated of the particular subject before Him, rises to a more general view which commands the whole question. Thus, from this moment He makes the particular difference respecting fasting subordinate to the general opposition between the old and new order of things—an idea which carries Him back to the occasion of the scene, the call of a publican.

Ver. 36.† *First Parable.*—The T. R. says : "No man putteth a piece of new cloth unto an old garment." The Alex. var. has this : "No man, rending a piece from a new garment, putteth it to an old garment." In Matthew and Mark the new piece is taken from any piece of cloth ; in Luke, according to two readings, it is cut out of a whole garment ; the Alex. reading only puts this in a somewhat stronger form. The verb *σχιζει*, rends (Alex. *σχίσει*, will rend), in the second proposition might have the intransitive sense : "Otherwise the new [piece] maketh a rent [in the old]," which would come to the same meaning as the passage has in Matthew and Mark : "The new piece taketh away a part of the old, and the rent is made worse. But in Luke the context requires the active sense : "Otherwise it [the piece used to patch with] rendeth the new [garment]." This is the only sense admissible in the Alex. reading, after the partic. *σχίσας, rending*, in the preceding proposition. The received reading equally requires it : for, *First*. The second inconvenience indicated, "the new agreeth not with the old," would be too slight to be placed after that of the enlargement of the rent. *Second*. The evident correlation between the two *καί, both . . and . . .* contains the following idea : the two garments, both the new and the old, are spoiled together ; the new, because it has been rent to patch the old ; the old, because it is disfigured by a piece of different cloth. Certainly it would still be possible to refer the expression, *not agree*, not to the incongruity in appearance of the two cloths, but to the stronger and more resisting quality of the new cloth—an inequality which would have the effect

* See Gess, "Christi Zeugniss," pp. 19, 20.

† Ver. 36. ℵ. B. D. L. X. Z. several Mnn. Syr. It^{alii}. omit *απο* before *ιματιου*. ℵ. B. D. L. Z. some Mnn. add *σχισας* before *επιβαλλει*. ℵ. B. C. D. L. X., *σχισει, συμφωνησει*, instead of *σχιζει, συμφωνει*. ℵ. B. C. L. X. Δ. add *το επιβλημα* before *το απο του καινου*.

of increasing the rent. This would be the untoward result intended in Matthew and Mark. But the term *συμφονεῖν, to harmonize*, refers much more naturally to a contrast in appearance between the two cloths. The futures, *will rend, will agree*, in the Alex. reading, may be defended ; but are they not a correction proceeding from the use of the future in the second parable (*will break, will be spilled, will perish*, ver. 37)? The corrector, in this case, could not have remembered that, in the case of the wine and the leathern bottles, the damage is only produced after a time, while in the garment it is immediate. To sum up : in Matthew and Mark there is only a single damage, that which befalls the old garment, the rent of which is enlarged ; in Luke the damage is twofold : in one case affecting the new garment, which is cut into to patch the other ; in the other, affecting the old garment, as in Matthew and Mark, but consisting in the patchwork appearance of the cloths, and not in the enlargement of the rent.

In the application it is impossible not to connect this image of the piece of new cloth with the subject of the previous conversation, the rite of fasting, while we admit that Jesus generalizes the question. Moses had nowhere prescribed monthly or weekly fasts. The only periodical fast commanded in the law was annual—that on the day of atonement. The regular fasts, such as those which the adversaries of Jesus would have had him impose on His disciples, were one of those pharisaical inventions which the Jews called *a hedge about the law*, and by which they sought to complete and maintain the legal system. John the Baptist himself had been unable to do anything better than attach himself to this method. This is the patching-up process which is indicated in Matthew and Mark, and which is opposed to the mode of action adopted by Jesus—the total substitution of a new for an old garment. In Luke the image is still more full of meaning : Jesus, alluding to that new, unconstrained, evangelical fasting, of which He has spoken in ver. 34, and which He cannot at present require of His disciples, makes the general declaration that it is necessary to wait for the new life before creating its forms ; it is impossible to anticipate it by attempting to adapt to the legal system, under which His disciples are as yet living, the elements of the new state which He promises them. His mission is not to labor to repair and maintain an educational institution, *now decaying and waxing old* (*παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον*). He is not a patcher, as the Pharisees were, nor a reformer, like John the Baptist. *Opus majus!* It is a new garment that He brings. To mix up the old work with the new, would be to spoil the latter without preserving the former. It would be a violation of the unity of the spiritualism which he was about to inaugurate, and to introduce into the legal system an offensive medley. Would not the least particle of evangelical freedom suffice to make every legal observance fall into disuse? Better then let the old garment remain as it is, until the time comes to substitute the new for it altogether, than try to patch it up with strips taken from the latter! As Lange says ("Leben Jesu," ii. p. 680) : "The work of Jesus is too good to use it in repairing the worn garment of pharisaical Judaism, which could never thereby be made into anything better than the assumed garb of a beggar." This profound idea of the mingling of the new holiness with the ancient legalism comes out more clearly from Luke's simile, and cannot have been introduced into the words of Jesus by him. Neander thinks that the old garment must be regarded as the image of the old unregenerate nature of the disciples, on which Jesus could not impose the forms of the new life. But the moral nature of man cannot be

compared to a garment ; it is the man himself.* Gess applies the image of the piece of new cloth to the asceticism of John the Baptist. This meaning might suffice for the form of it in Matthew and Mark ; but it leaves Luke's form of it (a piece of the new garment) unexplained.

What a view of His mission this word of Jesus reveals ! What a lofty conception of the work He came to accomplish ! From what a height He looks down, not only on the Pharisees, but on John himself, the great representative of the old covenant, the greatest of those born of women ! And all this is expressed in the simplest, homeliest manner, thrown off with the greatest facility ! He speaks as a being to whom nothing is so natural as the sublime. All that has been called the system of Paul, all that this apostle himself designates his gospel—the decisive contrast between the two covenants, the mutual exclusiveness of the systems of law and grace, of *the oldness of the letter* and *the newness of the spirit* (Rom. 7 : 6), this inexorable dilemma : "If by grace, then is it no more of works ; if it be of works, then is it no more grace" (Rom. 11 : 6), which constitutes the substance of the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians—all is contained in this homely figure of a garment patched with a piece of cloth, or with part of a new garment ! How can any one, after this, maintain that Jesus was not conscious from the beginning of the bearing of His work, as well of the task He had to accomplish in regard to the law, as of His Messianic dignity ? How can any one contend that the Twelve, to whom we owe the preservation of this parable, were only narrow Jewish Christians, as prejudiced in favor of their law as the most extreme men of the party ? If they perceived the meaning of this saying alone, the part attributed to them becomes impossible. And if they had no comprehension of it, how was it that they thought it worthy of a place in the teaching of Jesus, which they handed down with such care to the Church ?

Often, after having presented an idea by means of a parable, from a feeling that the figure employed fails to represent it completely, Jesus immediately adds a second parable, designed to set forth another aspect of the same idea. In this way are formed what may be called the pairs of parables, which are so often met with in the Gospels (the grain of mustard-seed and the leaven ; the treasure and the pearl ; the unwise builder and the imprudent warrior ; the sower and the tares). Following the same method, Jesus here adds to the parable of the piece of cloth that of the leathern bottles.

Vers. 37, 38.† *The Second Parable.*—The figure is taken from the Oriental custom of preserving liquids in leathern bottles, made generally of goat-skins. "No one," says M. Pierotti, "travels in Palestine without having a leathern bottle filled with water among his luggage. These bottles preserve the water for drinking, without imparting any ill taste to it ; also wine, oil, honey, and milk."‡ In this parable there is evidently an advance on the preceding, as we always find in the case of double parables. This difference of meaning, misapprehended by Neander and the greater part of interpreters, comes out more particularly from two features : 1. The opposition between the unity of the garment in the first, and the plurality of the bottles in the second ; 2. The fact that, since the new wine answers to the new garment,

* Eph. 4 : 22, 24, is a metaphor, not a parable.

† Ver. 38. ℵ. B. L. and some Mnn. omit the words, *και αμφοτεροι συντηρουνται.*

‡ "Macpelah," p. 78. The author gives a detailed description of the way in which these bottles are made.

the new bottles must represent a different and entirely new idea. In fact, Jesus here is no longer opposing the evangelical principle to the legal principle, but the representatives of the one to those of the other. Two complaints were raised against Jesus: *First.* His negligence of the legal forms; to this accusation He has just replied. *Second.* His contempt for the representatives of legalism, and His sympathy with those who had thrown off the theocratic discipline. It is to this second charge that He now replies. Nothing can be more simple than our parable from this point of view. The new wine represents that living and healthy spirituality which flows so abundantly through the teaching of Jesus; and the bottles, the men who are to become the depositaries of this principle, and to preserve it for mankind. And whom in Israel will Jesus choose to fulfil this part? The old practitioners of legal observance? Pharisees puffed up with the idea of their own merit? Rabbis jaded with textual discussions? Such persons have nothing to learn, nothing to receive from Him! If associated with His work, they could not fail to falsify it, by mixing up with His instructions the old prejudices with which they are imbued; or even if they should yield their hearts for a moment to the lofty thought of Jesus, it would put all their religious notions and routine devotion to the rout, just as new and sparkling wine bursts a worn-out leathern bottle. Where, then, shall He choose His future instruments? Among those who have neither merit nor wisdom of their own. He needs fresh natures, souls whose only merit is their receptivity, new men in the sense of the *homo novus* among the Romans, fair tablets on which His hand may write the characters of divine truth, without coming across the old traces of a false human wisdom. "God, I thank Thee, because Thou hast hidden these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them to these babes" (Luke 10:21). These babes will save the truth, and it will save them; this is expressed by these last words: "and both, the wine and the bottles, are preserved." These words are omitted in Luke by some Alex. They are suspected of having been added from Matthew, where they are not wanting in any document; Meyer's conjecture, that they have been suppressed, in accordance with Mark, is less probable.

It has been thought that the old bottles represent the unregenerate nature of man, and the new bottles, hearts renewed by the Gospel. But Jesus would not have represented the destruction of the old corrupt nature by the Gospel as a result to be dreaded; and He would scarcely have compared new hearts, the works of His Holy Spirit, to bottles, the existence of which precedes that of the wine which they contain. Lange and Gess see in the old bottles a figure of the legal forms, in the new bottles the image of the evangelical forms. But Christian institutions are an emanation of the Christian spirit, while the bottles exist independently of the wine with which they are filled. And Jesus would not have attached equal importance to the preservation of the wine and of the bottles, as He does in the words: "And both are preserved." It is a question, then, here of the preservation of the Gospel, and of the salvation of the individuals who are the depositaries of it. Jesus returns here to the fact which was the occasion of the whole scene, and which had called forth the dissatisfaction of His adversaries, the call of Levi the publican. It is this bold act which He justifies in the second parable, after having vindicated, in the first, the principle on which it was based. A new system demands new persons. This same truth will be applied on a larger scale, when, through the labors of St. Paul, the gospel shall pass from the Jews to the Gentiles, who are the new men in the kingdom of God.

Ver. 39.* *The Third Parable.*—The thorough opposition which Jesus has just established between the legal system and the evangelical system (first parable), then between the representatives of the one and those of the other (second parable) must not lead the organs of the new principles to treat those of the ancient order with harshness. They must remember that it is not easy to pass from a system, with which one has been identified from childhood, to an entirely different principle of life. Such men must be allowed time to familiarize themselves with the new principle that is presented to them; and we must beware how we turn our backs upon them, if they do not answer, as Levi the publican did, to the first call. The conversion of a publican may be sudden as lightning, but that of a scrupulous observer of the law will, as a rule, be a work of prolonged effort. This figure, like that of the preceding parable, is taken from the actual circumstances. Conversation follows a meal; the wine in the bottles circulates among the guests. With the figure of the bottles, which contain the wine, is easily connected the idea of the individuals who drink it. The new wine, however superior may be its quality, owing to its sharper flavor, is always repugnant to the palate of a man accustomed to wine, the roughness of which has been softened by age. In the same way, it is natural that those who have long rested in the works of the law, should at first take alarm—Jesus can well understand it—at the principle of pure spirituality. It is altogether an error in the Alex. that has erased here the word *εὐθέως, immediately.* The very idea of the parable is concentrated in this adverb. We must not judge such people by their first impression. The antipathy which they experience at the first moment will perhaps give place to a contrary feeling. We must give them time, as Jesus did Nicodemus. There is a tone of kindly humor in these words: *for he saith,* "Attempt to bring over to gospel views these old followers of legal routine, and immediately they tell you . . ." If, with the Alex. the positive *χρηστός* is read: "the old is mild," the repugnance for the new wine is more strongly marked than if we read, with the T. R., the comparative: *χρηστότερος, milder;* for in the first case the antithesis implied is: "The new is not mild at all." As the idea of comparison runs through the entire phrase, the copyists were induced to substitute the comparative for the positive. The Alex. reading is therefore preferable.

"It was a great moment," as Gess truly says, "when Jesus proclaimed in a single breath these three things: the absolute newness of His Spirit, His dignity as the Husband, and the nearness of His violent death." If the first parable contains the germ of Paul's doctrine, and the second foreshadows His work among the Gentiles, the third lays down the principle whence He derived His mode of acting toward His fellow-countrymen; making Himself all things to all by subjecting Himself to the law, in order to gain them that were under the law (1 Cor. 9 : 19, 20). What gentleness, condescension, and charity breathe through this saying of Jesus! What sweetness, grace, and appropriateness characterize its form! Zeller would have us believe ("Apostelgesch." p. 15) that Luke invented this touching saying, and added it on his own authority, in order to render the decided Paulinism of the two preceding parables acceptable to Jewish-Christian readers. But does he not see that in saying this he vanquishes himself by his own hand? If the two former parables are so Pauline, that Luke thought he must soften down their meaning by a corrective of his own invention, how comes it to pass that the two other Syn., the Gospels which are in the main Jewish-Christian, have transmitted them to the Church, without the slightest softening down? Criticism sometimes loses its clear-sightedness through excessive

* D. It$^{\text{plerique}}$, and probably Eusebius, omit this verse. ℵ. B. C. L. omit *ευθεως*. ℵ. B. L. two Mnn. Syr$^{\text{sch.}}$, *χρηστος* instead of *χρηστοτερυς*.

sharpness. That the ultra-Pauline Marcion should have omitted this third parable is perfectly natural; it proves that he thoroughly understood it, for it carries with it the condemnation of his system. But no consequence unfavorable to its authenticity can be drawn from this. The omission of this verse in D., and some versions, is no less easily explained by its omission in the two other synoptics.

The independence of Luke's text, and the originality of its sources, come out clearly from this last passage, which forms such an excellent close to this portion. The difference which we have pointed out in the purport of the first parable, a difference which is entirely in Luke's favor, also attests the excellence of the document from which he has drawn. As to the others, they are no more under obligation to Luke than Luke is to them; would they, of their own accord, have made the teaching of Jesus more anti-legal than it was?

5. *A Sabbath Scene:* 6 : 1-5.—The two Sabbath scenes which follow, provoke, at last, the outbreak of the conflict, which, as we have seen, has long been gathering strength. We have already noted several symptoms of the hostility which was beginning to be entertained toward Jesus: ver. 14 (*for a testimony unto them*); ver. 21 (*he blasphemeth*); vers. 30-33 (the censure implied in both questions). It is the apparent contempt of Jesus for the ordinance of the Sabbath, which in Luke as well as in John (chaps. 5 and 9), alike in Galilee and in Judæa, provokes the outbreak of this latent irritation, and an open rupture between Jesus and the dominant party. Is there not something in this complete parallelism that abundantly compensates for the superficial differences between the synoptical narrative and John's?

Vers. 1–5 * The term *second-first* is omitted by the Alex. But this omission is condemned by Tischendorf himself. Matthew and Mark presented nothing at all like it, and they did not know what meaning to give to the word, which is found nowhere else in the whole compass of sacred and profane literature. There are half a score explanations of it. Chrysostom supposed that when two festival and Sabbath days followed each other, the first received the name of *second-first:* the first of the two. This meaning does not give a natural explanation of the expression. Wetstein and Storr say that the first Sabbath of the first, second, and third months of the year were called first, second, and third; the second-first Sabbath would thus be the *first* Sabbath of the *second* month. This meaning, although not very natural, is less forced. Scaliger thought that, as they reckoned seven Sabbaths from the 16th Nisan, the second day of the Passover feast, to Pentecost, the second-first Sabbath denoted the first of the seven Sabbaths: the *first* Sabbath after the *second* day of the Passover. This explanation, received by De Wette, Neander, and other moderns, agrees very well with the season when the following scene must have taken place. But the term does not correspond naturally with the idea. Wieseler supposes that the first Sabbath of each of the seven years which formed a Sabbatic cycle was called first, second, third Sabbath: thus the second-first Sabbath would denote the *first* Sabbath of the *second* year of the septenary cycle. This explanation has been favorably received by modern exegesis. It appears to us, however, less probable than that which Louis Cappel was the first to offer: The civil year of the Israelites commencing in autumn, in the month Tizri (about mid-September to mid-October), and the ecclesiastical year in the month Nisan (about mid-March to mid-April), there were

* Ver. 1. ℵ. B. L. some Mnn. Syr^{sch}. It^{alliq}. omit δευτεροπρωτω. Ver. 2. ℵ. B. C. L. X. some Mnn. omit αυτοις. Ver. 3. ℵ. B. D. L. X. Syr. omit ουτες. Ver. 4. ℵ. D. K. Π. some Mnn. omit ελαβε και; B. C. L. X. read λαβων. Ver. 5. D. places this verse after ver. 10. See at ver. 5 (the end.)

thus every year two first Sabbaths : one at the commencement of the civil year, of which the name would have been *first-first ;* the other at the beginning of the religious year, which would be called *second-first.* This explanation is very simple in itself, and the form of the Greek term favors it : *second-first* signifies naturally a *first* doubled or *twice over* (*bissé*). But there is yet another explanation which appears to us still more probable. Proposed by Selden,* it has been reproduced quite lately by Andreæ in his excellent article on the day of Jesus' death.† When the observers intrusted with the duty of ascertaining the appearance of the new moon, with a view to fixing the first day of the month, did not present themselves before the commission of the Sanhedrim assembled to receive their deposition until after the sacrifice, this day was indeed declared the first of the month, or *monthly* (*σάββατον πρῶτον, first Sabbath*) ; but as the time of offering the sacrifice of the new moon was passed, they sanctified the following day, or second of the month (*σάββατον δευτεροπρῶτον, second-first* Sabbath), as well. This meaning perfectly agrees with the idea naturally expressed by this term (a first twice over), and with the impression it gives of having been taken from the subtleties of the Jewish calendar.

Bleek, ill-satisfied with these various explanations, supposes an interpolation. But why should it have occurred in Luke rather than in Matthew and Mark ? Meyer thinks that a copyist had written in the margin *πρώτῳ, first,* in opposition to *ἑτέρῳ, the other* (Sabbath). ver. 6 ; that the next copyist, wishing, in consideration of the Sabbath indicated 4 : 31, to correct this gloss, wrote *δευτέρῳ, second,* in place of *πρώτῳ, first ;* and that, lastly, from these two glosses together came the word *second-first,* which has made its way into the text. What a tissue of improbabilities ! Holtzmann thinks that Luke had written *πρώτῳ, the first,* dating from the journey recorded in 4 : 44, and that in consideration of 4 : 31 some over-careful corrector added *the second ;* whence our reading. But is not the interval which separates our narrative from 4 : 44 too great for Luke to have employed the word *first* in reference to this journey ? And what object could he have had in expressing so particularly this quality of first ? Lastly, how did the gloss of this copyist find its way into such a large number of documents ? Weizsäcker (" Unters." p. 59) opposes the two first Sabbaths mentioned in 4 . 16, 33, to the two mentioned here (vers. 1, 6), and thinks that the name *second-first* means here the *first* of the *second* group. How can any one attribute such absurd trifling to a serious writer ! This strange term cannot have been invented by Luke ; neither could it have been introduced accidentally by the copyists. Taken evidently from the Jewish vocabulary, it holds its place in Luke, as a witness attesting the originality and antiquity of his sources of information. Further, this precise designation of the Sabbath when the incident took place points to a narrator who witnessed the scene.

From Mark's expression *παραπορευεσθαι, to pass by the side of,* it would seem to follow that Jesus was passing *along the side of,* and not, as Luke says, *across* the field (*διαπορεύεσθαι*). But as Mark adds : *through the corn,* it is clear that he describes two adjacent fields, separated by a path. The act of the disciples was expressly authorized by the law (Deut. 23 : 25). But it was done on the Sabbath day ; there was the grievance. To gather and rub out the ears was to harvest, to grind, to labor ! it was an infraction of the thirty-nine articles which the Pharisees had framed into

* " De anno civili et calendario veteris ecclesiæ judaicæ."
† In the journal ; *Beweis des Glaubens,* September, 1870.

a Sabbatic code. Ψώχοντες, *rubbing out*, is designedly put at the end of the phrase: this is the labor! Meyer, pressing the letter of Mark's text, ὁδὸν ποιεῖν, *to make a way*, maintains that the disciples were not thinking of eating, but simply wanted to make themselves a passage across the field by plucking the ears of corn. According to him, the middle ποιεῖσθαι, not the active ποιεῖν, would have been necessary for the ordinary sense. He translates, therefore: they cleared a way by *plucking* (τίλλοντες) the ears of corn (Mark omits ψώχοντες, *rubbing them out*). He concludes from this that Mark alone has preserved the exact form of the incident, which has been altered in the other two through the influence of the next example, which refers to food. Holtzmann takes advantage of this idea to support the hypothesis of a proto-Mark. But, 1. What traveller would ever think of clearing a passage through a field of wheat by plucking ear after ear? 2. If we were to lay stress on the active ποιεῖν, as Meyer does, it would signify that the disciples made a road for the public, and not for themselves alone; for in this case also the middle would be necessary! The ordinary sense is therefore the only one possible even in Mark, and the critical conclusions in favor of the proto-Mark are without foundation. The Hebraistic form of Luke's phrase (ἐγένετο . . . καὶ ἔτιλλον) which is not found in the other two, proves that he has a particular document. As to who these accusers were, comp. 5 : 17, 21 : 30–33. The word αὐτοῖς, which the Alex. omits, has perhaps been added on account of the plural that follows: *Why do ye . . . ?* It follows from this incident that Jesus passed a spring, and consequently a Passover also, in Galilee before His passion. A remarkable coincidence also with the narrative of John (6 : 4). The illustration taken from 1 Sam. 21, cited in vers. 3 and 4, is very appropriately chosen. Jesus would certainly have had no difficulty in showing that the act of the disciples, although opposed perhaps to the Pharisaic code, was in perfect agreement with the Mosaic commandment. But the discussion, if placed on this ground, might have degenerated into a mere casuistical question; He therefore transfers it to a sphere in which He feels Himself master of the position. The conduct of David rests upon this principle, that in exceptional cases, when a moral obligation clashes with a ceremonial law, the latter ought to yield. And for this reason. The rite is a means, but the moral duty is an end; now, in case of conflict, the end has priority over the means. The absurdity of Pharisaism is just this, that it subordinates the end to the means It was the duty of the high priest to preserve the life of David and his companions, having regard to their mission, even at the expense of the ritual commandment; for the rite exists for the theocracy, not the theocracy for the rite. Besides, Jesus means to clinch the nail, to show His adversaries—and this is the sting of His reply—that when it is a question of their own particular advantage (saving a head of cattle for instance) they are ready enough to act in a similar way, sacrificing the rite to what they deem a higher interest (13 : 11 *et seq.*). De Wette understands οὐδέ in the sense of *not even:* "Do you not even know the history of your great king?" This sense would come very near to the somewhat ironical turn of Mark: "Have you never read . . . —never once, in the course of your profound biblical studies?" But it appears more simple to explain it as Bleek does: "Have you not also read . . ? Does not this fact appear in your Bible as well as the ordinance of the Sabbath?" The detail: *and to those who were with him*, is not distinctly expressed in the O. T.; but whatever Bleek may say, it is implied; David would not have asked for five loaves for himself alone. Jesus mentions it because He wishes to institute a parallel between His apostles and David's followers. The pron. οἵς does

not refer to τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ as in Matthew (the present ἔξεστι does not permit of it), but to ἄρτους, as the object of φαγεῖν; εἰ μή is therefore taken here in its regular sense. It is not so in Matthew, where εἰ μή is used as in Luke 4 : 26, 27. Mark gives the name of the high priest as Abiathar, while according to 1 Sam. it was Ahimelech, his son (comp. 2 Sam. 8 : 17 ; 1 Chron. 8 : 16), or his father (according to Josephus, Antiq. vi. 12. 6). The question is obscure. In Matthew, Jesus gives a second instance of transgression of the Sabbath, the labor of the priests in the temple on the Sabbath day, in connection with the burnt-offerings and other religious services. If the work of God in the temple liberates man from the law of the Sabbath rest, how much more must the service of Him who is Lord even of the temple raise him to the same liberty !

The Cod. D. and one Mn. here add the following narrative : " The same day, Jesus, seeing a man who was working on the Sabbath, saith to him : O man, if thou knowest what thou art doing, blessed art thou ; but if thou knowest not, thou art cursed, and a transgressor of the law." This narrative is an interpolation similar to that of the story in John of the woman taken in adultery, but with this difference, that the latter is probably the record of a real fact, while the former can only be an invention or a perversion. Nobody could have labored publicly in Israel on the Sabbath day without being instantly punished ; and Jesus, who never permitted Himself the slightest infraction of a true commandment of Moses (whatever interpreters may say about it), certainly would not have authorized this premature emancipation in any one else.

After having treated the question from a legal point of view, Jesus rises to the principle. Even had the apostles broken the Sabbath rest, they would not have sinned ; for the Son of man has the disposal of the Sabbath, and they are in His service. We find again here the well-known expression, καὶ ἔλεγεν, *and He said to them*, the force of which is (see at ver. 36) : " Besides, I have something more important to tell you." The Sabbath, as an educational institution, is only to remain until the moral development of mankind, for the sake of which it was instituted, is accomplished. When this end is attained, the means naturally fall into disuse. Now, this moment is reached in the appearance of the Son of man. The normal representative of the race, He is Himself the realization of this end ; He is therefore raised above the Sabbath as a means of education ; He may consequently modify the form of it, and even, if He think fit, abolish it altogether. Καί : *even* of the Sabbath, this peculiar property of Jehovah ; with how much greater reason, of all the rest of the law ! * How can any one maintain, in the face of such a saying as this, that Jesus only assumed the part of the Messiah after the conversation at Cæsarea-Philippi (9 : 18), and when moved to do so by Peter ?

Mark inserts before this declaration one of those short and weighty sayings (he has preserved several of them), which he cannot have invented or added of his own authority, and which the other two Syn. would never have left out, had they made

* It is not without justification that Ritschl, in his fine work, " Entstehung der altkathol. Kirche," 2d ed., sets out to prove from this passage, which is common to the three Syn., that the abolition of the law, the necessary condition of Christian universalism, is not an idea imported into the religion of Jesus by Paul, but an integral element of the teaching of Jesus Himself. It belongs to that common foundation on which rest both the work of Paul and that of the Twelve ; this is already proved by the parable of the two garments (ver. 36).

use of his book or of the document of which he availed himself (the proto-Mark): "The Sabbath is made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." God did not create man for the greater glory of the Sabbath, but He ordained the Sabbath for the greater welfare of man. Consequently, whenever the welfare of man and the rest of the Sabbath happen to clash, the Sabbath must yield. *So that* (ὥστε, Mark 2 : 28) the Son of man, inasmuch as He is head of the race, has a right to dispose of this institution. This thought, distinctly expressed in Mark, is just what we have had to supply in order to explain the argument in Luke.

Are we authorized to infer from this saying the immediate abolition of every Sabbatic institution in the Christian Church? By no means. Just as, in His declaration, vers. 34, 35, Jesus announced not the abolition of fasting, but the substitution of a more spiritual for the legal fast, so this saying respecting the Sabbath foreshadows important modifications of the form of this institution, but not its entire abolition. It will cease to be a slavish observance, as in Judaism, and will become the satisfaction of an inward need. Its complete abolition will come to pass only when redeemed mankind shall all have reached the perfect stature of the Son of man. The principle: *The Sabbath is made for man*, will retain a certain measure of its force as long as this earthly economy shall endure, for which the Sabbath was first established, and to the nature of which it is so thoroughly fitted.

6. *A Second-Sabbath Scene:* 6 : 6–11.—Vers. 3–11.* Do Matthew and Mark place the following incident on the same day as the preceding? It is impossible to say (πάλιν, in Mark, does not refer to 2 : 23, but to 1 : 21). Luke says positively, on *another* Sabbath. He has therefore His own source of information. This is confirmed by the character of the style, which continues to be decidedly Hebraistic (καὶ . . . καὶ . . . instead of the relative pronoun). The withering of the hand denotes paralysis resulting from the absence of the vital juices, the condition which is commonly described as atrophy. In Matthew, the question whether it is right to heal on the Sabbath day is put to the Lord by His adversaries, which, taken literally, would be highly improbable. It is evident that Matthew, as usual, condenses the account of the fact, and hastens to the words of Jesus, which he relates at greater length than the others. His adversaries, no doubt, did put the question, but, as Luke and Mark tell us, simply in intention and by their looks. They watch to see how He will act. The present θεραπεύει, *whether He heals*, in the Alex., would refer to the habit of Jesus, to His principle of conduct. This turn of expression is too far-fetched. The spies want more particularly to ascertain what He will do now; from the fact they will easily deduce the principle. The received reading θεραπεύσει, *whether He will heal*, must therefore be preferred. The Rabbis did not allow of any medical treatment on the Sabbath day, unless delay would imperil life; the strictest school, that of Shammai, forbade even the consolation of the sick on that day (Schabbat xii. 1).

Ver. 8. Jesus penetrates at a glance the secret spy system organized against Him.

* Ver. 7. 14 Mjj. several Mnn. It. omit αυτον after δε. ℵ. A. D. L. Π.: θεραπευει instead of θεραπευσει. ℵ* B. S. X. some Mnn. Syr. It$^{aliq.}$: κατηγορειν instead of κατηγοριαν. Ver. 8. ℵ. B. L. some Mnn.: ανδρι instead of ανθρωπω. Ver. 9. ℵ. B. L.: επερωτω instead of επερωτησω. ℵ. B. D. L. It^{plerique}: υμας ει instead of υμας τι. ℵ. B. D. L. X. Syr$^{sch.}$ It^{plerique}: απολεσαι instead of αποκτειναι. Ver. 10. 13 Mjj.: αυτω instead of τω ανθρωπω, which is the reading of T. R. with ℵ. D. L. X. It. T. R. with K. Π. several Mnn.: εποιησεν ουτως: 12 Mjj. 80 Mnn. omit ουτως. ℵ. D. X. several Mnn. It. εξετεινεν. 11 Mjj. several Mnn. Syr. It. omit υγιης. 13 Mjj. many Mnn. read ως η αλλη, which T. R. with ℵ. B. L. omit.

and seems to take pleasure in giving the work He is about to perform the greatest publicity possible. Commanding the man to place himself in the midst of the assembly, He makes him the subject of a veritable theological demonstration. Matthew omits these dramatic details which Mark and Luke have transmitted to us. Would he have omitted them had he known them? He could not have had the alleged proto-Mark before him, unless it is supposed that the author of our canonical Mark added these details on his own authority. But in this case, how comes Mark to coincide with Luke, who, according to this hypothesis, had not our actual Mark in his hands, but simply the primitive Mark (the common source of our three Syn.)? Here plainly is a labyrinth from which criticism, having once entered on a wrong path, is unable to extricate itself. The skilfulness of the question proposed by the Lord (ver. 9) consists in its representing good omitted as evil committed. The question thus puts answers itself; for what Pharisee would venture to make the prerogative of the Sabbath to consist in a permission to torture and kill with impunity on that day? This question is one of those marks of genius, or rather one of those inspiration of the heart, which enhance our knowledge of Jesus. By reason of His compassion, He feels Himself responsible for all the suffering which He fails to relieve. But, it may be asked, could He not have put off the cure until the next day? To this question He would have given the same answer as any one of us: To-morrow belongs to God; only to-day belongs to me. The present ἐπερωτῶ, *I ask you* (Alex.), is more direct and severe, and consequently less suited the Lord's frame of mind at this moment, than the future of the T. R.: *I will ask you.* For the same reason, we think, we must read, not εἰ, *if*, or *is it*, with the Alex., but τί, and make this word not a complement: "I ask you what is allowable," a form in which the intentional sharpness of His address is softened down too much (see the contrary case, 7 . 40), but the subject of ἐξεστι: "I ask you; answer me! What is permitted, to . . . or to . . . for in my position I must do one or the other." Matthew places here the illustration of the sheep fallen into a ditch, an argument which, as we shall see, is better placed in Luke (14 : 5, 6). Ver. 10. A profound silence (Mark 3 . 4) is the only answer to this question Those who laid the snare are taken in it themselves. Jesus then surveys His adversaries, ranged around Him, with a long and solemn gaze. This striking moment, omitted in Matthew, is noticed in Luke; in Mark it is described in the most dramatic manner. We feel here how much Mark owes to some source of information closely connected with the person of the Saviour; he describes the feeling of sorrowful indignation which eye-witnesses could read in His glance: "with anger, being grieved at the hardness of their hearts." The command Jesus gives the sick man to stretch forth his hand, affords room for surprise. Is it not precisely what he was unable to do? But, like every call addressed to faith, this command contained a promise of the strength necessary to accomplish it, provided the will to obey was there. He must make the attempt, depending on the word of Jesus (ver. 5), and divine power will accompany the effort. The word ὑγιής is probably taken from Matthew; it is omitted by six Mjj. It would be hazardous, perhaps, to erase also the words ὡς ἡ ἀλλη with the three Mjj. which omit them. It is here that Cod. D. places the general proposition, ver. 5.

The Jewish-Christian Gospel which Jerome had found among the Nazarenes relates in detail the prayer of this sick man: "I was a mason, earning my livelihood with my own hands; I pray thee, Jesus, to restore me to health, in order that I may not with shame beg my bread." This is an instance of how amplification and vul-

garity meet us directly we step beyond the threshold of the canonical Gospels. Apostolical dignity has disappeared.

The word ἄνοια (ver. 11), properly *madness*, by which Luke expresses the effect produced on the adversaries of Jesus, denotes literally the absence of νοῦς, of the power to discriminate the true from the false. They were fools through rage, Luke means. In fact, passion destroys a man's sense of the good and true. Matthew and Mark notice merely the external result, the plot which from this moment was laid against the life of Jesus: "They took counsel to kill Him;" Mark adds to the Pharisees, the Herodians. The former, in fact, could take no effectual measures in Galilee against the person of Jesus without the concurrence of Herod; and in order to obtain this, it was necessary to gain over his counsellors to their plans. Why should they not hope to induce this king to do to Jesus what he had already done to John the Baptist?

Holtzmann thinks it may be proved, by the agreement of certain words of Jesus in the three narratives, that they must have had a common written source. As if words so striking as these: *The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath day*, could not be preserved by oral tradition! The characteristic divergences which we have observed at every line in the historical sketch of the narrative, are incompatible, as we have seen, with the use of a common document.

THIRD CYCLE.—CHAP. 6 : 12–8 : 56.

From the Election of the Twelve to their First Mission.

In the following section we shall see the Galilean ministry reach its zenith; it begins with the institution of the apostolate and the most important of Jesus' discourses during His sojourn in Galilee, the Sermon on the Mount; and it ends with a cycle of miracles that display the extraordinary power of Jesus in all its grandeur (8 : 22–56). The hostility against Him seems to moderate; but it is sharpening its weapons in secret; in a very little while it will break out afresh.

This section comprises eleven portions: 1*st*, the choosing of the Twelve, and the Sermon on the Mount (6 : 12–49); 2*d*, the healing of the centurion's servant (7 : 1–10); 3*d*, the raising of the widow's son at Nain (7 : 11–17); 4*th*, the question of John the Baptist, and the discourse of Jesus upon it (7 : 18–35); 5*th*, the woman that was a sinner at the feet of Jesus (7 : 36–50); 6*th*, the women who ministered to Jesus' support (8 : 1–3); 7*th*, the parable of the sower (8 : 4–18); 8*th*, the visit of the mother and brethren of Jesus (8 : 19–21); 9*th*, the stilling of the storm (8 : 22–25); 10*th*, the healing of the demoniac of Gadara (8 : 26–39; 11*th*, the raising of Jaïrus' daughter (8 : 40–56).

1. *The Choosing of the Twelve, and the Sermon on the Mount:* 6 : 12–49.—Our affixing this title to this portion implies two things: 1*st*, that there is a close connection between the two facts contained in this title; 2*d*. that the discourse, Luke 6 : 20–49. is the same as that we read in Matt. 5–7. The truth of the first supposition, from Luke's point of view, appears from ver. 20, where he puts the discourse which follows in close connection with the choosing of the Twelve which he has just narrated. The truth of the second is disputed by those who think that in consequence of this choice Jesus spoke two discourses—one on the summit of the mountain, addressed specially to His disciples—the second lower down on level ground, addressed to the multitude; the former, which was of a more private character, being that of Mat-

thew ; the latter, of a more popular aim, that of Luke.* They rely on the differences in substance and form between the two discourses in our two Gospels. In regard to the substance, the essential matter in the discourse of Matthew, the opposition between the righteousness of the Pharisees and the true righteousness of the kingdom of heaven, is not found at all in Luke. As to the form, in Matthew Jesus ascends the mountain to preach it, while in Luke He comes down, after having spent the night on the summit. Further, there He is seated (*καθίσαντος αὐτοῦ*, Matt. 5 : 1) ; here He appears to be standing (*ἔστη*, Luke 6 : 17). Notwithstanding these reasons, we cannot admit that there were two distinct discourses They both begin in the same way, with the beatitudes ; they both treat of the same subject, the righteousness of the kingdom of God—with this shade of difference, that the essence of this righteousness, in Matthew, is spirituality ; in Luke, charity. They both have the same conclusion, the parable of the two buildings. This resemblance in the plan of the discourse is so great that it appears to us decidedly to take precedence of the secondary differences. As to the differences of form, it should be observed that Luke's expression, *ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινοῦ*, literally, *on a level place*, denotes a flat place on the mountain. To denote the plain, Luke would have said, *ἐπὶ πεδίου*. Luke's expression is not, therefore, contradictory to Matthew's. The latter, as usual, giving a summary narrative, tells us that Jesus preached this time on the mountain, in opposition to the plain, the sea-side that is, where He usually preached ; while Luke, who describes in detail all the circumstances of this memorable day, begins by mentioning the night which Jesus spent alone on the summit of the mountain ; next he tells how He descended to a level place situated on the mountain side, where He stayed to speak to the people. This plateau was still the mountain in Matthew's sense. On the relation of *ἔστη* (Luke) to *He sat down* (Matthew), see on ver. 17.

In order to understand the Sermon on the Mount, it is necessary to form a correct view of the historical circumstances which were the occasion of it ; for this sermon is something more than an important piece of instruction delivered by Jesus ; it is one of the decisive acts of His ministry. We have pointed out in the preceding section the symptoms of a growing rupture between Jesus and the hierarchical party (vers. 14, 17, 21–23 ; 6 : 1 *seq*.). The bold attitude which Jesus assumes toward this party, challenging its hostility by calling a publican, by emphasizing in His teaching the antithesis between the old and new order of things, and by openly braving their Sabbatarian prejudices—all this enables us to see that a crisis in the development of His work has arrived. It is an exactly corresponding state of things for Galilee to that which was brought about in Judæa after the healing of the impotent man on the Sabbath (John 5). The choice of the Twelve and the Sermon on the Mount are the result and the solution of this critical situation. Up to this time Jesus had been satisfied with gathering converts about Him, calling some of them to accompany Him habitually as disciples. Now He saw that the moment was come to give His work a more definite form, and to organize His adherents. The hostile army is preparing for the attack ; it is time to concentrate His own forces ; and consequently He begins, if I may venture to say so, by drawing up His list of officers. The choosing of the Twelve is the first constitutive act accomplished by Jesus Christ. It is the first measure, and substantially (with the sacraments) the only measure, of organization

* Lange, "Leben Jesu," book ii. pp. 567–570. St. Augustine and the greater part of the Latin Fathers of the Church hold that there were two discourses.

which He ever took. It sufficed Him, since the college of the Twelve, once constituted, was in its turn to take what further measures might be required when the time came for them. The number 12 was significant. Jesus set up in their persons the twelve patriarchs of a new people of God, a spiritual Israel, that was to be substituted for the old. Twelve new tribes were to arise at their word and form the holy humanity which Jesus came to install in the earth. An act more expressly Messianic it is impossible to conceive; and the criticism which maintains that it was only at Cæsarea Philippi, and at the instigation of Peter, that Jesus decisively accepted the part of Messiah, must begin by effacing from history the choosing of the Twelve, with its manifest signification. Further, this act is the beginning of the divorce between Jesus and the ancient people of God. The Lord does not begin to frame a new Israel until He sees the necessity of breaking with the old. He has labored in vain to transform; nothing now remains but to substitute. This attentive crowd which surrounds Him on the mountain is the nucleus of the new people; this discourse which He addresses to them is the promulgation of the new law by which they are to be governed; this moment is the solemn inauguration of the people of Jesus Christ upon the earth—of that people which, by means of individual conversions, is eventually to absorb into itself all that belongs to God among all other peoples. Hence this discourse has a decidedly inaugural character—a character which, whatever Weizsäcker * may say about it, belongs no less to its form in Luke than to its form in Matthew. In the latter, Jesus addresses Himself, if you will to the apostles, but as representing the entire new Israel. In Luke, He rather speaks, if you will, to the new Israel, but as personified in the person of the apostles. In reality this makes no difference. The distinction between apostles and believers is nowhere clearly asserted. Every believer is to be *the salt of the earth, the light of the world* (Matthew); every apostle is to be one of those *poor, hungry, weeping, persecuted* ones of which the new people is to be composed (Luke). Just as, at Sinai, Jehovah makes no distinction between priests and people, so it is His people, with all the constitutive elements of their life, whose appearance Jesus hails, whose new character He portrays, and whose future action on the world He proclaims. Further, He felt most deeply the importance of this moment, and prepared Himself for it by a whole night of meditation and prayer. The expressions of Luke upon this point (ver. 12) have, as we shall see, quite a special character.

The Sermon on the Mount occupies quite a different place in Matthew to that which it holds in Luke. That evangelist has made it the opening of the Galilean ministry, and he places it, therefore, immediately after the call of the four first disciples. Historically speaking, this position is a manifest anachronism How, at the very commencement of His work, could Jesus speak of persecutions for His name, as He does, Matt. 5 : 10, 11, or feel it necessary to justify Himself against the charge of destroying the law (ver. 17), and to give a solemn warning to false disciples (7 : 21–23)? The position of the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew is only to be understood from the systematic point of view from which this evangelist wrote. There was no better way in which the author could show the Messianic dignity of Jesus than by opening the history of His ministry with this discourse, in which was laid down the basis of that spiritual kingdom which the Messiah came to found. If the collection of the discourses composed by Matthew, of which Papias speaks, really existed,

* "Untersuchungen über die evang. Gesch." pp. 45 and 46, note.

and served as a foundation for our Gospel, the position which this discourse occupies in the latter is fully accounted for.

As to Mark, we can easily perceive the precise point in his sketch where the Sermon on the Mount should come in (3 : 13 *et seq.*). But the discourse itself is wanting, doubtless because it was no part of his design to give it to his readers. Mark's narrative is nevertheless important, in that it substantiates that of Luke, and confirms the significance attributed by this evangelist to the act of the choosing of the Twelve. This comparison with the two other Syn. shows how well Luke understood the development of the work of Jesus, and the superior chronological skill with which he compiled his narrative (*καθεξῆς γράψαι*, 1 : 3).

Gess has replied to our objections against the chronological accuracy of Matthew's narrative (*Litter. Anzeiger* of Andreæ, September, 1871) in the following manner: The mention of the persecutions might refer to the fact mentioned John 4 : 1, and to the fate of John the Baptist : the charge of undermining the law had already been made in Judæa (comp. John 5) ; the false disciples might have been imitators of the man who wrought cures in the name of Jesus (Luke 9 : 49 ; Mark 9 : 38), although of a less pure character. And, in any case, the time of the discourse indicated by Luke does not differ sensibly from that at which Matthew places it. But neither the hostility which Jesus had met with in Judæa, nor the accusations which had been laid against Him there, could have induced Him to speak as He did in the Sermon on the Mount, unless some similar events, such as those which St. Luke has already related, had taken place in this province, and within the knowledge of the people. It is quite possible that the facts related by Luke do not prove any very great interval between the time to which he assigns this discourse and the beginning of the Galilean ministry, at which Matthew places it. But they serve at least as a preparation for it, and give it just that historical foundation which it needs, while in Matthew it occurs *ex abrupto*, and without any historical framework. The fact that the call of Matthew is placed in the first Gospel (9 : 9) after the Sermon on the Mount, which supposes this call already accomplished (Luke 6 : 12 *et seq.*), would be sufficient, if necessary to show that this discourse is detached, in this Gospel, from its true historical context.

1*st.* Vers. 12–19. *Choosing of the Twelve.*—Ver. 12.* Luke has already brought before us more than once the need of prayer, which so often drew Jesus away into solitude (4 : 42, 5 : 6). But the expressions he makes use of here are intended to carry special weight. *Διανυκτερεύειν, to pass the night in watching*, is a word rarely used in Greek, and which in all the N. T. is only found here. The choice of this unusual term, as well as the analytical form (the imperf. with the participle), express the persevering energy of this vigil. The term *προσευχὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, literally, *prayer of God*, is also an unique expression in the N. T. It does not denote any special request, but a state of rapt contemplation of God's presence, a prayer arising out of the most profound communion with Him. The development of the work of Jesus having now reached a critical point, during this night He laid it before God, and took counsel with Him. The choosing of the twelve apostles was the fruit of this lengthened season of prayer ; in that higher light in which Jesus stood, it appeared the only measure answering to the exigencies of the present situation. The reading *ἐξελθεῖν* is a correction of the Alexandrian purists for *ἐξῆλθεν*, which, after *ἐγένετο*, offended the Greek ear.

Vers. 13–17*a*.† In the execution, as in the choice, of this important measure,

* ℵ Δ. B. D. L., *εξελθειν αυτον* instead of *εξηλθεν*.

† Ver. 14. ℵ. B. D. K. L. Δ. Π. 20 Mnn. Syr^{sch}. It^{aliq}. read *και* before *Ιακωβον*. ℵ. B. D. L. Syr^{sch}. It^{aliq}. read *και* before *Φίλιππον*. Ver. 15. The same, or nearly

Jesus no doubt submitted Himself to divine direction. His numerous disciples spent the night not far from the mountain-top to which He withdrew. During this lengthened communion, He presented them all, one by one, to His father; and God's finger pointed out those to whom He was to intrust the salvation of the world. When at last all had been made perfectly clear, toward morning He called them to Him, and made the selection which had thus been prearranged. The *καί, also*, indicates that the title proceeded from Jesus, as well as the commission. Schleiermacher thought that this nomination was made simply in reference to the following discourse, of which these twelve were to be the official hearers, and that the name apostles (ver. 13, "whom He also named apostles") might have been given them on some other occasion, either previous or subsequent. The similar expression relative to Peter, ver. 14, might favor this latter opinion. Nevertheless, it is natural to suppose that He entitled them apostles when He first distinguished them from the rest of the disciples, just as He gave Simon the surname Peter when He met him for the first time (John 1). And if these twelve men had been chosen to attend Jesus officially simply on this occasion, they would not be found the same in all the catalogues of apostles. The fact of this choice is expressly confirmed by Mark (3 : 13. 14), and indirectly by John (6 : 70): "Have not I chosen you twelve (*ἐξελεξάμην*)?" The function of the apostles has often been reduced to that of simple witnesses. But this very title of apostles, or ambassadors, expresses more, comp. 2 Cor. 5 : 20, "We are ambassadors for Christ . . . and we beseech you to be reconciled to God." When Jesus says, "I pray for them who shall believe on me through their word," the expression *their word* evidently embraces more than the simple narration of the facts about Jesus and His works. The marked prominence which Luke, together with Mark, gives to the choosing of the Twelve, is the best refutation of the unfair criticism which affects to discover throughout his work indications of a design to depreciate them.

According to Keim (t. ii. p. 305), the choice of the Twelve must have taken place later on, at the time of their first mission, 9 : 1 *et seq.* It is then, in fact, that Matthew gives the catalogue, 10 : 1 *et seq.* His idea is that Luke imagined this entire scene on the mountain in order to refer the choosing of the apostles to as early a period as possible, and thus give a double and triple consecration to their authority, and that thus far Mark followed him. But Luke, he believes, went much further still. Wanting to put some discourse into the mouth of Jesus on this occasion, he availed himself for this purpose of part of the Sermon on the Mount, though it was a discourse which had nothing in common with the occasion. Mark, however, rejected this amplification, but with the serious defect of not being able to assign any adequate reason for the choosing of the apostles at this time. Thus far Keim. But, 1. The preface to the account of the first apostolic mission in Matthew (10 : 1), "and having called to Him the twelve disciples, He gave them . . ." does away with the idea of their having been chosen just at this time, and implies that this event had already taken place. According to Matthew himself, the college of the Twelve is already in existence; Jesus calls them to set them to active service. 2. A scene described in such solemn terms as that of Luke (Jesus spending a night in prayer to God), cannot be an invention on his part, consistently with the slightest pretensions to good faith. 3. The narrative of Mark is an indisputable confirmation of Luke's; for it is independent of it, as appears from the way, so completely his own, in which he defines the object of choosing the apostles. 4. We have seen how exactly this measure was adapted to that stage of development which the work of Jesus had now reached. 5. Does not rationalistic criticism condemn itself, by attributing to Luke here the entire

so: *και* before *Ματθαιον* and *Ιακωβον*. Ver. 16. The same, or nearly so: *και* before *Ιουδαν*. ℵ. B. D. L., *Ισκαριωθ* instead of *Ισκαριωτην*. ℵ. B. L. It. omit *και* after *ος*.

invention of a scene designed to confer the most solemn consecration on the apostolic authority of the Twelve, and by asserting elsewhere that this same Luke labors to depreciate them (the Tübingen school, and, to a certain extent, Keim himself ; see on 9 : 1)?

The four catalogues of apostles (Matt. 10 : 2 *et seq.* ; Mark 3 : 16 *et seq.* ; Luke 6 ; and Acts 1 : 13) present three marks of resemblance : 1*st*. They contain the same names, with the exception of Jude the son of James, for whom in Mark Thaddæus is substituted, and in Matthew Lebbæus, surnamed Thaddæus (according to the received reading), Thaddæus (according to ℵ. B.), Lebbæus (according to D.). 2*d*. These twelve are distributed in the four lists into three groups of four each, and no individual of either of these groups is transferred to another. We may conclude from this that the apostolical college consisted of three concentric circles, of which the innermost was in the closest relations with Jesus. 3*d*. The same three apostles are found at the head of each quaternion, Peter, Philip, and James. Besides this quaternary division, Matthew and Luke indicate a division into pairs, at least (according to the received reading, in Luke, and certainly in Matthew) for the last eight apostles. In the Acts, the first four apostles are connected with each other by καί ; the remaining eight are grouped in pairs.

Luke places at the head of them the two brothers, Simon and Andrew, with whom Jesus became acquainted while they were with the Forerunner (John 1). At the first glance, Jesus had discerned that power of taking the lead, that promptness of view and action, which distinguished Peter. He pointed him out at the time by the surname כֵּיפָא, in Aramæan כֵּיפָא, *Cephas* (properly a *mass of rock*), as he on whom He would found the edifice of His Church. If the character of Peter was weak and unstable, he was none the less for that the bold confessor on whose testimony the Church was erected in Israel and among the heathen (Acts 2 and 10). There is nothing in the text to indicate that this surname was given to Peter at this time. The aor. ὠνόμασε indicates the act simply, without reference to time. The καί merely serves to express the identity of the person (ver. 16). Andrew was one of the first believers. At the time when Jesus chose the Twelve, he was no doubt appointed at the same time as Peter ; but he gradua ly falls below James and John, to whom he appears to have been inferior ; he is placed after them in Mark and in the Acts. The order followed by Luke indicates a very primitive source. Andrew is very often found associated with Philip (John 6 : 7-9, 12 : 21, 22). In their ordinary life he formed the link between the first and the second group, at the head of which was Philip.

The second pair of the first group is formed by the two sons of Zebedee, James and John. Mark supplies (3 : 17) a detail respecting them which is full of interest : Jesus had surnamed them *sons of thunder*. This surname would have been offensive had it expressed a fault ; it denoted, therefore, rather the ardent zeal of these two brothers in the cause of Jesus, and their exalted affection for His person. This feeling which burned within their hearts, came forth in sudden flashes like lightning from the cloud. John 1 : 42 * contains a delicate trace of the calling of James ; this,

* Probably it is ver. 41 that is meant. M. Godet, following the usual opinion that the unnamed disciple of ver. 40 is John, the writer of the Gospel, seems to understand the next verse as intimating that Andrew found his brother Simon before John found his brother James. Alford's view is, that both disciples (John and Andrew) went to seek Simon, but that Andrew found him first.—Translator.

therefore, must have taken place while he was with John the Baptist, immediately after that of his brother. James was the first martyr from the number of the apostles (Acts 12). This fact is only to be explained by the great influence which he exerted after Pentecost. John was the personal friend of Jesus, who doubtless felt Himself better understood by him than by any of the others. While the other disciples were especially impressed by His miracles, and stored up His moral teaching, John, attracted rather by His person, treasured up in his heart those sayings in which Jesus unfolded His consciousness of Himself. Wieseler has tried to prove that these two brothers were first-cousins of Jesus, by Salome, their mother, who would have been the sister of the Virgin Mary. Comp. Matt. 27 : 5, 6, Mark 15 : 40, with John 19 : 25. But this interpretation of the passage in John is hardly natural.

The second quaternion, which no doubt comprised natures of a second order, contained also two pairs. The first consists, in all three Gospels, of Philip and Bartholomew. In the Acts, Philip is associated with Thomas. Philip was the fifth believer (John 1) ; he was originally from Bethsaida, as were also the preceding four. John 6 : 5 seems to show that Jesus was on terms of special cordiality with him. The name Bartholomew signifies *son of Tolmai ;* it was therefore only a surname. It has long been supposed that the true name of this apostle was Nathanael. John 21 : 2, where Nathanael is named among a string of apostles, proves unquestionably that he was one of the Twelve. Since, according to John 1, he had been drawn to Jesus by Philip, it is natural that he should be associated with him in the catalogues of the apostles.

Matthew and Thomas form the second pair of the second group in the three Syn., while in the Acts Matthew is associated with Bartholomew. One remarkable circumstance, all the more significant that it might easily pass unperceived, is this, that while in Mark and Luke Matthew is placed first of the pair, in our first Gospel he occupies the second place. Further, in this Gospel also, the epithet *the publican* is added to his name, which is wanting in the two others. Are not these indications of a personal participation, more or less direct, of the Apostle Matthew in the composition of the first Gospel ? Having been formerly a toll-collector, Matthew must have been more accustomed to the use of the pen than his colleagues. It is not surprising, therefore, that he should be the first among them who felt called to put into writing the history and instructions of Jesus. The account of his calling implies that he possessed unusual energy, decision, and strength of faith. Perhaps it was for that reason Jesus saw fit to associate him with Thomas, a man of scruples and doubts. The name of the latter signifies *a twin.* The circumstances of his call are unknown. He was doubtless connected with Jesus first of all as a simple disciple, and then his serious character attracted the attention of the Master. If the incident 9 : 59, 60 was not placed so long after the Sermon on the Mount, we might be tempted with some writers to apply it to Thomas.

The third quaternion contains the least striking characters in the number of the Twelve. All these men, however, not excepting Judas Iscariot, have had their share in the fulfilment of the apostolic task, the transmission of the holy figure of the Christ to the Church through all time. The stream of oral tradition was formed by the affluents of all these sources together. The last pair comprises here, as in the Acts, James the son of Alphæus, and Simon the Zealot. But the distribution is different in the two other Syn. It has been generally allowed since the fourth century that this James is the person so often mentioned, in the Acts and the Galatians, as the *brother*

of the Lord, the first head of the flock at Jerusalem. This identity is made out, (1) by applying to him the passage Mark 15 : 40, according to which his surname would have been *the less* or *the younger* (relatively to James the son of Zebedee), and his mother would have been a Mary, whom, according to John 19 : 25, we should have to regard as a sister (probably sister-in-law) of the mother of Jesus ; (2) by identifying the name of his father Alphæus with the name Clopas (חַלְפַי = Κλωπᾶς), which was borne, according to Hegesippus, by a brother of Joseph ; (3) by taking the term brother in the sense of cousin (of the Lord). But this hypothesis cannot, in our judgment, be maintained : (1) The word ἀδελφός, *brother*, used as it is by the side of μήτηρ, *mother* (" the mother and brethren of Jesus"), can only signify *brother* in the proper sense. The example often cited, Gen. 13 : 8, when Abraham says to Lot, " We are brethren," is not parallel. (2) John says positively (7 : 5) that the brethren of Jesus did not believe on Him, and this long after the choice of the Twelve (John 6 : 70). This is confirmed by Luke 8 : 19 *et seq.* ; comp. with Mark 3 : 20–35. One of them could not, therefore, be found among His apostles. A comparison of all the passages leads us to distinguish, as is generally done at the present day, three Jameses : the first, the son of Zebedee (ver. 14) ; the second, the son of Alphæus indicated here, whom there is nothing to prevent our identifying with James the less, the son of Clopas and Mary, and regarding him as the first-cousin of Jesus ; the third, the brother of the Lord, not a believer before the death of Jesus, but afterward first bishop of the flock at Jerusalem.

The surname *Zealot*, given to Simon, is probably a translation of the adj. *kanna* (in the Talmud, *kananit*), *zealous*. If this be correct, this apostle belonged to that fanatical party which brought about the ruin of the people, by leading them into war against the Romans. This sense corresponds with the epithet Καναίτης, which is applied to him in the Byz. reading of Matthew and Mark, confirmed here by the authority of the Sinait. This name is simply the Hebrew term, translated by Luke, and Hellenized by Matthew and Mark. The reading Καναναῖος in some Alex. may signify either *Canaanite* or *citizen of Cana*. This second etymology is not very probable. The first would be more so, if in Matt. 15 : 22 this word, in the sense of Canaanite, were not written with an X instead of a K. Luke has therefore given the precise meaning of the Aramæan term employed in the document of which he availed himself (Keim, t. ii. p. 319).

The last pair comprises the two Judes. There were in fact two men of this name in the apostolic college, although Matthew and Mark mention but one, Judas Iscariot. This is very clear from John 14 . 22 : " Judas, not Iscariot, saith to Him." The names Lebbæus and Thaddæus, in Matthew and Mark, are therefore surnames, derived, the former from לֵב, *heart*, the latter either from תַּד, *mamma*, or from שַׁדַּי, *potens*. The name Thaddaï is of frequent occurrence in the Talmud. These surnames were probably the names by which they were usually designated in the Church. The genitive Ἰακώβου must, according to usage, signify *son of James* ; this was to distinguish this Judas from the next. With the desire to make this apostle also a cousin of Jesus, the phrase has frequently been translated *brother* of James, that is to say, of the son of Alphæus, mentioned in ver. 15. But there is no instance of the genitive being used in this sense. In the 14th verse, Luke himself thought it necessary to use the full expression, τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. And would not the two other Syn., who join Lebbæus immediately to James, have indicated this relationship ?

As there was a town called Kerijoth in Judæa, it is probable that the name Iscariot signifies *a man of Kerijoth* (at the present day Kuriut), toward the northern boundary of Judæa. The objections which De Wette has raised against this etymology are without force. He proposes, with Lightfoot, the etymology *ascara, strangulation.* Hengstenberg prefers *isch schéker, man of falsehood*, from which it would follow that this surname was given *post eventum.* These etymologies are all the more untenable, that in the fourth Gospel, according to the most probable reading (Ἰσκαριώτου, 6 : 71 and elsewhere), this surname Iscariot must have been originally that of the father of Judas. The character of this man appears to have been cold, reserved, and calculating. He was so very reserved that, with the exception perhaps of John, none of the disciples guessed his secret hatred. In the coolness of his audacity, he ventured to cope with Jesus Himself (John 12 : 4, 5). With what motive did Jesus choose a man of this character? He had spontaneously joined himself, as did so many others, to the number of His disciples ; there was therefore a germ of faith in him, and perhaps, at the outset, an ardent zeal for the cause of Jesus. But there also existed in him, as in all the others, the selfish views and ambitious aspirations which were almost inseparable from the form which the Messianic hope had taken, until Jesus purified it from this alloy. In the case of Judas, as of all the others, it was a question which of the two conflicting principles would prevail in his heart : whether faith, and through this the sanctifying power of the spirit of Jesus, or pride, and thereby the unbelief which could not fail eventually to result from it. This was, for Judas, a question of moral liberty. As for Jesus, He was bound to submit in respect to him, as in respect to all the others, to God's plan. On the one hand, He might certainly hope, by admitting Judas into the number of His apostles, to succeed in purifying his heart, while by setting him aside He might irritate him and estrange him forever. On the other hand, He certainly saw through him sufficiently well to perceive the risk He ran in giving him a place in that inner circle which He was about to form around His person. We may suppose, therefore, that, during that long night which preceded the appointment of the Twelve, this was one of the questions which engaged His deepest solicitude ; and certainly it was not until the will of His Father became clearly manifest that He admitted this man into the rank of the Twelve, notwithstanding His presentiment of the heavy cross He was preparing for Himself (John 6 : 64 and 71). Still, even Judas fulfilled his apostolic function ; his despairing cry, "I have betrayed the innocent blood!" is a testimony which resounds through the ages as loudly as the preaching of Peter at Pentecost, or as the cry of the blood of James, the first martyr. The καί, *also*, after ὅς (ver. 16), omitted by some authorities, is perhaps taken from the two other Syn. If it is authentic, it is intended to bring out more forcibly, through the identity of the person, the contradiction between his mission and the course he took.

Surrounded by the Twelve and the numerous circle of disciples from which He had chosen them, Jesus descends from the summit of the mountain. Having reached a level place on its slopes, He stops ; the crowd which was waiting for Him toward the foot of the mountain, ascends and gathers about Him. Τόπος πεδινός, a level place on an inclined plane. Thus the alleged contradiction with the expression, *the mountain*, in Matthew disappears (see above). The ἔστη, *He stood still*, in opposition to *having come down*, does not in any way denote the attitude of Jesus during the discourse. There is therefore no contradiction between this expression and Matthew's *having sat down.* What are we to say of the discovery of Baur, who thinks that, by

substituting *having come down*, ver. 16, for *He went up*, Matt. 5 : 1, Luke intended to degrade the Sermon on the Mount ! *

Vers. 17*b*–19. † We might make ὄχλος πλῆθος, *the crowd, the multitude*, etc., so many subjects of ἔστη : "He stood still, along with the crowd . . ." But it is more natural to understand some verb : "And there was with Him the crowd . . ." In any case, even if, with the Alex., we omit the καί before ἐθεραπεύοντο, *were healed* (ver. 18), we could not think of making these subst. nominatives to this last verb ; for the crowd of disciples, etc., was not composed of sick people. Three classes of persons, therefore, surrounded Jesus at this time : occasional hearers (the *multitude* come together from all parts), the permanent disciples (the *crowd of disciples*), and the apostles. The first represent the people in so far as they are called to the kingdom of God ; the second, the Church ; the third, the ministry in the Church. The term *crowd*, to denote the second, is not too strong. Did not Jesus take out of them, only a little while after, seventy disciples (10 : 1) ? If, at the 18th verse, we read *and* before *they were healed*, the idea of healing is only accessory, and is added by way of parenthesis ; but the prevailing idea is that of gathering together : "Demoniacs also were there ; and what is more, they were healed." If the *and* is omitted, the idea of healing alone remains, and we must translate : "And the possessed even were healed." With παραλίου we must understand χώρας ; Τύρου and Σιδῶνος are complements. Ver. 19 describes the mighty working of miraculous powers which took place that day. It was a time similar to that which has been described 4 : 40 *et seq.*, but to a far higher degree. Ἰᾶτο depends on ὅτι, and has for its subject δύναμις.

2*d*. Vers. 20–29. *The Sermon.*—The aim, prevailing thought, and plan of this discourse have been understood in many different ways. The solution of these questions is rendered more difficult by the difference between the two accounts given by Matthew and Luke. As to its aim, Weizsäcker regards the Sermon on the Mount as a grand proclamation of the kingdom of God, addressed to the whole people ; and it is in Matthew's version that he finds the best support for this view of it. He acknowledges, nevertheless, that the fact stated in the preface (5 : 1, 2 : "He taught them [His disciples], saying . . .") is not in harmony with this design. Luke, according to him, has deviated further even than Matthew from its original aim, by modifying the entire discourse, to make it an address to the disciples alone. Ritschl and Holtzmann, on the contrary, think that the discourse was addressed originally to the disciples alone, and that Luke's version of it has preserved with greater accuracy its real tenor ; only the situation described vers. 17–19 would not, according to Holtzmann, accord with its being addressed to them. Keim reconciles all these different views by distinguishing two principal discourses, one addressed to all the people, about the time of the Passover feast, of which we have fragments in Matt. 6 : 19–34, 7 : 7–11, 1–5, 24–27. This inaugural discourse would be on the chief care of human life. The second is supposed to have been addressed somewhat later to the disciples only, about the time of Pentecost. Matt. 5 is a summary of it. This would be a word of welcome addressed by Jesus to His disciples, and an exposition of the new law as the fulfilment of the old. As to the criticism on the Pharisaical virtues, Matt. 6 : 1-18, it is doubtless closely related, both in substance and time, to the preceding discourse ; but it did not form part of it.

* "Die Evangelien," p. 457.

† Ver. 17. ℵ. B. L. Syr^{sch}. read πολυς after οχλος. Ver. 18. ℵ. A. B. D. L. Q. some Mnn. It. omit και before εθεραπευοντο.

The prevailing idea in Matthew is certainly an exposition of the new law in its relations with the old. In Luke. the subject is simply the law of charity, as the foundation of the new order of things. Many critics deny that any agreement can be found between these two subjects. According to Holtzmann, the 5th chapter of Matthew should be regarded as a separate dissertation which the author of the first Gospel introduced into the Sermon ; Keim thinks that Luke, as a disciple of Paul, wanted to detach the new morality completely from the old. The anonymous Saxon even sets himself to prove that the Sermon on the Mount was transformed by Luke into a cutting satire against—Saint Peter !

As to the plan of the discourse, many attempts have been made to systematize it. Beck : (1) the doctrine of happiness (beatitudes) ; (2) that of righteousness (the central part in Matthew and Luke) ; (3) that of wisdom (conclusion). Oosterzee : (1) the salutation of love (Luke, vers. 20–26) ; (2) the commandment of love (vers. 27–38) ; (3) the impulse of love (vers. 39–49) The best division, regarding it in this abstract way, and taking Matthew as a basis, is certainly that of Gess : (1) the happiness of those who are fit to enter into the kingdom (Matt. 5 : 3–12) ; (2) the lofty vocation of the disciples (Matt. 5 : 13–16) ; (3) the righteousness, superior to that of the Pharisees, after which they must strive who would enter into the kingdom (5 : 17–6 : 34) ; the rocks on which they run a risk of striking (the disposition to judge, intemperate proselytizing, being led away by false prophets) ; next, the help against these dangers, with the conclusion (7 : 1–27).

The solution of these different questions, as it seems to us, must be sought first of all in the position of affairs which gave rise to the Sermon on the Mount. In order to see it reproduced, as it were, before our eyes, we have only to institute a comparison. Picture a leader of one of those great social revolutions, for which preparations seem making in our day. At an appointed hour he presents himself, surrounded by his principal adherents, at some public place ; the crowd gathers ; he communicates his plans to them. He begins by indicating the class of persons to which he specially addresses himself : you, poor working people, loaded with suffering and toil ! and he displays to their view the hopes of the era which is about to dawn. Next, he proclaims the new principle which is to govern humanity in the future : "The mutual service of mankind ; justice, universal charity !" Lastly, he points out the sanction of the law which he proclaims, the penalties that await those who violate it, and the rewards of those who faithfully keep it. This is the caricature ; and by the aid of its exaggerations, we are able to give some account of the features of the original model. What, in fact, does the Sermon on the Mount contain ? Three things : 1*st.* An indication of the persons to whom Jesus chiefly addressed Himself, in order to form the new people (Luke, vers. 20–26 ; Matt. 5 : 1–12) ; 2*d.* The proclamation of the fundamental principle of the new society (Luke, vers. 27 : 45 ; Matt. 5 : 13–7 : 12) ; 3*d.* An announcement of the judgment to which the members of the new kingdom of God will have to submit. (Luke, vers. 46–49 ; Matt. 7 : 13–27). In other words : the call, the declaration of principles, and their sanction. This is the order of the discourse. There is nothing artificial about this plan. It is not a logical outline forcibly fitted to the discourse ; it is the result of the actual position of the work of Jesus, just as we have stated it. The discourse itself explains for whom it is intended. Jesus addresses the mass of the people present, as forming the circle within which the new order of things is to be realized, and at the same time the disciples and apostles, by means of whom this revolution is to be brought about.

Luke and Matthew, therefore, are not at variance in this matter, either with each other or with themselves. As to the fundamental idea of this discourse, see ver. 27.

First part : vers. 20–26. *The Call.*—This solemn invitation describes : (1*st.*) Those who are qualified to become members of the order of things inaugurated by Jesus (vers. 20–23) ; (2*d.*) Their adversaries (vers. 24–26). Matthew begins in the same way ; but there are two important differences between him and Luke : 1*st.* The latter has only four beatitudes ; Matthew has eight (not seven or nine, as is often said). 2*d.* To the four beatitudes of Luke are joined four woes, which are wanting in Matthew. In Luke's form, Keim sees nothing but an artificial construction. That would not in any case be the work of Luke, but of his document. For if there is any one portion which from its contents should be assigned to the primitive document (of an Ebionitish color), evidently it is this. But the context appears to us decisive in favor of Luke's version. This call deals with the conditions which qualify for entering into the kingdom. These are clearly indicated in the first four beatitudes of Matthew ; but the next four (mercy, purity of heart, a peaceable spirit, and joy under persecution) indicate the dispositions by means of which men will remain in the kingdom, and consequently their natural place is not in this call. It is only the eighth (Luke's fourth) which can belong here, as a transition from the persecuted disciples to the persecutors, who are the objects of the following woes. Two of the last four beatitudes of Matthew find their place very naturally in the body of the discourse. As to the woes, they perfectly agree with the context. After having proclaimed the blessedness of those who are qualified to enter, Jesus announces the unhappiness of those who are animated by contrary dispositions. Schleiermacher says : a harmless addition of Luke's. But, as we have just seen, Luke is here certainly only a copyist. A Gentile Christian would not have dreamed of identifying, as Judaism did, the two ideas of piety and poverty ; nor, on the other hand, riches and violence. De Wette says : the first manifestation of the fixed (Ebionitish) idea of Luke. But see 12 : 32, 16 : 27, and 18 : 18–30.

Vers. 20 and 21. " And He lifted up His eyes on His disciples, and said, Blessed be ye poor : for yours is the kingdom of God. 21. Blessed are ye that hunger now : for ye shall be filled. Blessed are ye that weep now : for ye shall laugh." The disciples are the constant hearers of Jesus, among whom He has just assigned a distinct place to His apostles. Luke does not say that Jesus spoke to them alone. He spoke to all the people, but regarding them as the representatives of the new order of things which He was about to institute. In Matthew, *αὐτούς*, ver. 2 (He taught *them*), comprises *both the people and the disciples*, ver. 1. This commencement of the Sermon on the Mount breathes a sentiment of the deepest joy. In these disciples immediately about Him, and in this multitude surrounding Him in orderly ranks, all eager to hear the word of God, Jesus beholds the first appearance of the true Israel, the true people of the kingdom. He surveys with deep joy this congregation which His father has brought together for Him, and begins to speak. It must have been a peculiarly solemn moment ; comp. the similar picture, Matt. 5 : 1, 2.

This assembly was chiefly composed of persons belonging to the poor and suffering classes. Jesus knew it ; He recognizes in this a higher will, and in His first words He does homage to this divine dispensation. *Πτωχός*, which we translate *poor*, comes from *πτώσσω, to make one's self little, to crouch,* and conveys the idea of humiliation rather than of poverty (*πένης*). *Πεινῶντες, the hungry* (a word connected with *πένης*), denotes rather those whom poverty condemns to a life of toil and privation.

This second term marks the transition to the third, *those who weep*, among whom must be numbered all classes of persons who are weighed down by the trials of life. All those persons who, in ordinary language, are called unhappy, Jesus salutes with the epithet *μακάριοι, blessed.* This word answers to the אַשְׁרֵי. *felicitates*, of the O. T. (Ps. 1 : 1 and elsewhere). The idea is the same as in numerous passages in which the poor and despised are spoken of as God's chosen ones, not because poverty and suffering are in themselves a title to His blessing, but they dispose the soul to those meek and lowly dispositions which qualify them to receive it, just as, on the other hand, prosperity and riches dispose the heart to be proud and hard. In the very composition of this congregation, Jesus sees a proof of this fact of experience so often expressed in the O. T. The joy which He feels at this sight arises from the magnificent promises which He can offer to such hearers.

The kingdom of God is a state of things in which the will of God reigns supreme. This state is realized first of all in the hearts of men, in the heart it may be of a single man, but speedily in the hearts of a great number ; and eventually there will come a day when, all rebellious elements having been vanquished or taken away, it will be found in the hearts of all. It is an order of things, therefore, which, from being inward and individual, tends to become outward and social, until at length it shall take possession of the entire domain of human life, and appear as a distinct epoch in history. Since this glorious state as yet exists in a perfect manner only in a higher sphere, it is also called the kingdom of heaven (the ordinary term in Matthew). Luke says : *is*—not *shall be*—yours ; which denotes partial present possession, and a right to perfect future possession. But are men members of this kingdom simply through being poor and suffering ? The answer to this question is to be found in what precedes, and in such passages as Isa. 66 . 2 . " To whom will I look ? saith the Lord. To him who is poor (עָנִי) and of a broken spirit, and who trembles at my word." It is to hearts which suffering has broken that Jesus brings the blessings of the kingdom. These blessings are primarily spiritual—pardon and holiness. But outward blessings cannot fail to follow them ; and this notion is also contained in the idea of a kingdom of God, for glory is the crown of grace The words of Jesus contain, therefore, the following succession of ideas : temporal abasement, from which come humiliation and sighing after God ; then spiritual graces, crowned with outward blessings. The same connection of ideas explains the beatitudes that follow. Ver. 21*a* : temporal poverty (being hungry) leads the soul to the need of God and of His grace (Ps. 42 : 1) ; then out of the satisfaction of this spiritual hunger and thirst arises full outward satisfaction (being filled). Ver. 21*b* : with tears shed over temporal misfortunes, is easily connected the mourning of the soul for its sins ; the latter draws down the unspeakable consolations of divine love, which eventually raise the soul to the triumph of perfect joy. The terms *κλαίειν, to sob, γελᾶν, to laugh*, cannot well be literally rendered here. They denote a grief and joy which find outward demonstration ; comp. Ps. 126 : 2, " Our mouth was filled with laughter," and Paul's *καυχᾶσθαι ἐν Θεῷ, to joy in God* (Rom. 5 : 11). The text of Matthew presents here two important differences : 1*st*. He employs the third person instead of the second : " Blessed are the poor, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven ; they that mourn, for they shall be comforted," etc. The beatitudes, which in Luke are addressed directly to the hearers, are presented here under the form of general maxims and moral sentences. 2*d*. In Matthew, these maxims have an exclusively spiritual meaning : " the poor in spirit, they who hunger after righteousness." Here interpreters are divided,

some maintaining that Matthew has spiritualized the words of Jesus ; others (as Keim), that Luke, under the influence of a prejudice against riches, has given to these blessings a grossly temporal meaning. Two things appear evident to us : (1) That the direct form of address in Luke, " Ye," can alone be historically accurate : Jesus was speaking to His hearers, not discoursing before them. (2) That this first difference has led to the second , having adopted the third person, and given the beatitudes that Maschal form so often found in the didactic parts of the O. T. (Psalms, Proverbs), Matthew was obliged to bring out expressly in the text of the discourse those moral aims which are inherent in the very persons of the poor whom Jesus addresses directly in Luke, and without which these words, in this abstract form, would have been somewhat too unqualified. How could one say, without qualification, Blessed are *the* poor, *the* hungry ? Temporal sufferings of themselves could not be a pledge of salvation. On the other hand, the form, Blessed are *ye* poor, *ye* hungry, in Luke, renders all such explanation superfluous. For Jesus, when He spoke thus, was addressing particular concrete poor and afflicted, whom He already recognized as His disciples, as believers, and whom He regarded as the representatives of that new people which He was come to install in the earth. That they were such attentive hearers sufficiently proved that they were of the number of those in whom temporal sufferings had awakened the need of divine consolation, that they belonged to those laboring and heavy-laden souls whom He was sent to lead to rest (Matt. 11 : 29), and that they hungered, not for material bread only, but for the bread of life, for the word of God, for God Himself. The qualification which Matthew was necessarily obliged to add, in order to limit the application of the beatitudes, in the general form which he gives to them, is in Luke then implied in this *ye*, which was only addressed to poor believers. These two differences between Matthew and Luke are very significant. They seem to me to prove : (1) that the text of Luke is a more exact report of the discourse than Matthew's ; (2) that Matthew's version was originally made with a didactic rather than a historical design, and consequently that it formed part of a collection of discourses in which the teaching of Jesus was set forth without regard to the particular circumstances under which He gave it, before it entered into the historical framework in which we find it contained at the present day.

Vers. 22 and 23.* " Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake. 23. Rejoice ye in that day, and leap for joy ; for, behold, your reward is great in heaven : for in like manner did their fathers unto the prophets." This fourth beatitude is completely accounted for, in Luke, by the scenes of violent hostility which had already taken place. It is not so well accounted for in Matthew, who places the Sermon on the Mount at the opening of the ministry of Jesus. In Matthew, this saying, like the preceding, has the abstract form of a moral maxim : " Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake ; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." But Jesus was certainly not giving utterance here to abstract principles of Christian morality ; He spoke as a living man to living men. Besides, Matthew himself passes, in the next verse, to the form of address adopted by Luke from the commencement. The explanatory adjunct, *for righteousness' sake*, in Matthew, is to be ascribed to the same cause as the similar

* Ver. 23. All the Mjj., *χαρητε* instead of *χαιρετε*, the reading of T. R. with some Mnn. B. D. Q. X. Z. Syr^{sch}. It$^{aliq.}$, *κατα τα αυτα* instead of *κατα ταυτα*.

qualifications in the preceding beatitudes. By the pres. ἔστε, "happy are ye," Jesus transports His hearers directly into this immediate future. The term ἀφορίζειν, *to separate*, refers to exclusion from the synagogue (John 9 : 22). The strange expression, *cast out your name*, is explained in very *jejune* fashion, both by Bleek, to pronounce the name with disgust, and by De Wette and Meyer, to refuse altogether to pronounce it. It refers rather to the expunging of the name from the synagogue roll of membership. There is not, on this account, any tautology of the preceding idea. *To separate, to insult*, indicated acts of unpremeditated violence ; *to erase the name* is a permanent measure taken with deliberation and coolness. Πονηρόν, *evil*, as an epitome of every kind of wickedness. In their accounts of this saying, this is the only word left which Matthew and Luke have in common. Instead of *for the Son of man's sake*, Matthew says *for my sake*. The latter expression denotes attachment to the person of Jesus ; the former faith in His Messianic character, as the perfect representative of humanity. On this point also Luke appears to me to have preserved the true text of this saying ; it is with His work that Jesus here wishes to connect the idea of persecution. This idea of submission to persecution along with, and for the sake of, the Messiah, was so foreign to the Jewish point of view that Jesus feels He must justify it. The sufferings of the adherents of Jesus will only be a continuation of the sufferings of the prophets of Jehovah. This is the great matter of consolation that He offers them. They will be, by their very sufferings, raised to the rank of the old prophets ; the recompense of the Elijahs and Isaiahs will become theirs. The reading κατὰ τὰ αὐτά, *in the same manner*, appears preferable to the received reading κατὰ ταῦτα, *in this manner*. Τά and αὐτά have probably been made into one word. The imperf. ἐποίουν (treated) indicates habit. The pronoun αὐτῶν, *their* fathers, is dictated by the idea that the disciples belong already to a new order of things. The word *their* serves as a transition to the woes which follow, addressed to the heads of the existing order of things.

Vers. 24–26.* "But woe unto you that are rich ! for ye have received your consolation. 25. Woe unto you that are full ! for ye shall hunger. Woe unto you that laugh now ! for ye shall mourn and weep. 26. Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you ! for so did their fathers to the false prophets." Jesus here contemplates in spirit those adversaries who were sharpening against Him only just before (ver. 11) the sword of persecution : the rich and powerful at Jerusalem, whose emissaries surrounded Him in Galilee. Perhaps at this very moment He perceives some of their spies in the outer ranks of the congregation. Certainly it is not the rich, as such, that He curses, any more than He pronounced the poor as such blessed. A Nicodemus or a Joseph of Arimathea will be welcomed with open arms as readily as the poorest man in Israel. Jesus is dealing here with historical fact, not with moral philosophy. He takes the fact as it presented itself to Him at that time. Were not the rich and powerful, as a class, already in open opposition to His mission ? They were thus excluding themselves from the kingdom of God. The fall of Jerusalem fulfilled only too literally the maledictions to which Jesus gave utterance on that solemn day. The πλήν, *except, only*, which we can only render by *but* (ver. 24), makes the persons here designated an exception as regards the preceding

* Ver. 25. 9 Mjj. some Mnn. read ννν after εμπεπλησμενοι. ℵ. B. K. L. S. X. Z. and some Mnn. omit the second υμιν. Ver. 26. 20 Mjj. omit υμιν, which is the reading of T. R. with B. Δ. only. 8 Mjj. 100 Mnn. omit παντες. The MSS. are divided between κατα ταυτα (T. R.) and κατα τα αυτα.

beatitudes. The term *rich* refers to social position, *full* to mode of living; the expression, *you that laugh*, describes a personal disposition. All these outward conditions are considered as associated with an avaricious spirit, with injustice, proud self-satisfaction, and a profane levity, which did indeed attach to them at that time. It was to the Pharisees and Sadducees more particularly that these threatenings were addressed. The word *νῦν*, *now*, which several MSS. read in the first proposition, is a faulty imitation of the second, where it is found in all the documents. It is in place in the latter; for the notion of laughing contains something more transient than that of being full. The expression *ἀπέχετε*, which we have rendered by *ye have received*, signifies: you have taken and carried away everything; all therefore is exhausted. Comp. 16 : 25. The terms hunger, weeping, were literally realized in the great national catastrophe which followed soon after this malediction; but they also contain an allusion to the privations and sufferings which await, after death, those who have found their happiness in this world. In ver. 26 it is more particularly the Pharisees and scribes, who were so generally honored in Israel, that Jesus points out as continuing the work of the false prophets. These four woes would be incompatible with the spiritual sense of the terms *poor*, *hungry*, etc., in the beatitudes.

The second part of the discourse: vers. 27–45. *The New Law.*—Here we have the body of the discourse. Jesus proclaims the supreme law of the new society. The difference from Matthew comes out in a yet more striking manner in this part than in the preceding. In the first Gospel, the principal idea is the opposition between legal righteousness and the new righteousness which Jesus came to establish. He Himself announces the text of the discourse in this saying (ver. 20): "Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." The law, in the greater number of its statutes, seemed at first sight only to require outward observance. But it was evident to every true heart, that by these commandments the God of holiness desired to lead His worshippers, not to hypocritical formalism, but to spiritual obedience. The tenth commandment made this very clear, as far as respected the decalogue. Israelitish teaching should have labored to explain the law in this truly moral sense, and to have carried the people up from the letter to the spirit, as the prophets had endeavored to do. Instead of that, Pharisaism had taken pleasure in multiplying indefinitely legal observances, and in regulating them with the minutest exactness, urging the letter of the precept to such a degree as sometimes even to make it contradict its spirit. It had stifled morality under legalism. Comp. Matt. 15 : 1–20 and 23. In dealing with this crying abuse, Jesus breaks into the heart of the letter with a bold hand, in order to set free its spirit, and displaying this in all its beauty, casts aside at once the letter, which was only its imperfect envelope, and that Pharisaical righteousness, which rested on nothing else than an indefinite amplification of the letter. Thus Jesus finds the secret of the abolition of the law in its very fulfilment. Paul understood and developed this better than anybody. What, in fact, is the legislator's intention in imposing the letter? Not the letter, but the spirit. The letter, like the thick calyx under the protection of which the flower, with its delicate organs, is formed, was only a means of preserving and developing its inward meaning of goodness, until the time came when it could bloom freely. This time had come. Jesus on the mountain proclaims it. And this is why this day is the counterpart of the day of Sinai. He opposes the letter of the divine commandment, understood as letter, to the spirit contained in it, and develops this contrast, Matt. 5, in a series of antitheses so strik-

ing that it is impossible to doubt either their authenticity or that they formed the real substance, the centre of the Sermon on the Mount. Holtzmann will never succeed in persuading any one to the contrary; his entire critical hypothesis as to the relations of the Syn. will crumble away sooner than this conviction. The connection of the discourse in Matthew is this: 1. Jesus discloses wherein the Pharisaical righteousness fails, its want of inward truth (vers. 13–48). 2. He judges, by this law, the three positive manifestations of this boasted righteousness: almsgiving, prayer, and fasting (6 : 1–18). 3. He attacks two of the most characteristic sins of Pharisaism: covetousness and censoriousness (6 : 19–34; 7 : 1–5). 4. Lastly there come various particular precepts on prayer, conversion, false religious teaching, etc. (7 : 6–20). But between these precepts it is no longer possible to establish a perfectly natural connection. Such is the body of the Sermon in Matthew: at the commencement, an unbroken chain of thought; then a connection which becomes slighter and slighter, until it ceases altogether, and the discourse becomes a simple collection of detached sayings. But the fundamental idea is still the opposition between the formalism of the ancient righteousness and the spirituality of the new.

In Luke also, the subject of the discourse is the perfect law of the new order of things; but this law is exhibited, not under its abstract and polemical relation of spirituality, but under its concrete and positive form of charity. The plan of this part of the discourse, in Luke, is as follows: 1*st*. Jesus describes the practical manifestations of the new principle (vers. 27–30); then, 2*d*. He gives concise expression to it (ver. 31); 3*d*. He indicates the distinctive characteristics of charity, by contrasting this virtue with certain natural analogous sentiments (vers. 32–35*a*); 4*th*. He sets forth its model and source (vers. 35*b* and 36); 5*th*. Lastly, He exhibits this gratuitous, disinterested love as the principle of all sound judgment and salutary religious teaching, contrasting in this respect the new ministry, which He is establishing in the earth in the presence of His disciples, with the old, which, as embodied in the Pharisees, is vanishing away (vers. 37–45).

At the first glance there seems little or nothing in common between this body of the discourse and that which, as we have just seen, Matthew gives us. We can even understand, to a certain extent, the odd notion of Schleiermacher, that these two versions emanated from two hearers, of whom one was more favorably situated for hearing than the other! The difference, however, between these two versions may be accounted for by connecting the fully developed subject in Luke with the subject of the last two of the six antitheses, by which Jesus describes (Matt. 5) the contrast between legal righteousness and true righteousness. Jesus attacks, vers. 38–48, the Pharisaical commentary on these two precepts of the law: *an eye for an eye* . . . and, *thou shalt love* thy *neighbor as thyself*. This commentary, by applying the *lex talionis*, which had only been given as a rule for the judges of Israel, to private life, and by deducing from the word *neighbor* this consequence: therefore thou mayest hate him who is not thy neighbor, that is to say, the foreigner, or thine enemy, had entirely falsified the meaning of the law on these two points. In opposition to these caricatures, Jesus sets forth, in Matthew, the inexhaustible and perfect grace of charity, as exhibited to man in the example of his heavenly Benefactor; then He proceeds to identify this charity in man with the divine perfection itself: "Be ye perfect [through charity], as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Now it is just at this point that Luke begins to appropriate the central part of the discourse. These last two antitheses, which terminate in Matthew in the lofty thought (ver. 48) of man

being elevated by love to the perfection of God, furnish Luke with the leading idea of the discourse as he presents it—namely, charity as the law of the new life. Its theme is in this way modified in form, but it is not altered in substance. For if, as St. Paul says, Rom. 13 : 10, "charity is the fulfilling of the law;" if perfect spirituality, complete likeness to God, consists in charity; the fundamental agreement between these two forms of the Sermon on the Mount is evident. Only Luke has deemed it advisable to omit all that specially referred to the ancient law and the comments of the Pharisees, and to preserve only that which has a universal human bearing, the opposition between charity and than natural selfishness of the human heart.

The two accounts being thus related, it follows, that as regards the original structure of the discourse, in so far as this was determined by opposition to Pharisaism, Matthew has preserved it more completely than Luke. But though this is so, Matthew's discourse still contains many details not originally belonging to it, which Luke has very properly assigned to entirely different places in other parts of his narrative. We find here once more the two writers following their respective bent: Matthew, having a didactic aim, exhibits in a general manner the teaching of Jesus on the righteousness of the kingdom, by including in this outline many sayings spoken on other occasions, but bearing on the same subject; Luke, writing as a historian, confines himself more strictly to the actual words which Jesus uttered at this time. Thus each of them has his own kind of superiority over the other.

1*st.* The manifestations of charity: vers. 27–30. To describe the manifestations of this new principle, which is henceforth to sway the world, was the most popular and effectual way of introducing it into the consciences of his hearers. Jesus describes, first of all, charity in its active form (vers. 27 and 28); then in its passive form of endurance (vers. 29 and 30).

Vers. 27, 28.* "But I say unto you which hear, Love your enemies, do good to them which hate you. 28. Bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you." There is a break in the connection between ver. 26 and ver. 27. De Wette and Meyer think that the link is to be found in this thought understood: "Notwithstanding these curses which I pronounce upon the rich, your persecutors, I command you not to hate, but to love them." But in the verses that follow, it is not the rich particularly that are represented as the enemies whom His disciples should love. The precept of love to enemies is given in the most general manner. Rather is it the new law which Jesus announces here, as in Matthew. The link of connection with what goes before is this: In the midst of this hatred of which you will be the objects (ver. 22), it will be your duty to realize in the world the perfect law which I to-day proclaim to you. Tholuck, in his "Explanation of the Sermon on the Mount" (p. 498), takes exception to Luke for giving these precepts a place here, where they have no connection; but he thus shows that he has failed to understand the structure of this discourse in our Gospel, as we have exhibited it. In this form of expression: *But I say unto you which hear*, there is an echo as it were of the antithesis of Matthew: "Ye have heard . . . But I say unto you." By this expression, *you which hear*, Jesus opposes the actual hearers surrounding Him to those imaginary hearers to whom the preceding woes were addressed. We

* Ver. 28. The MSS. are divided between *υμας* and *υμιν*. All the Mjj. omit *και* before *προσευχεσθε*, which is the reading of T. R. with merely some Mnn. The MSS. are divided between *περι* and *υπερ*.

must conceive of the words, ver. 27 and ver. 28, as having been pronounced with some kind of enthusiasm. These precepts overflow with love. You have only to meet every manifestation of hatred with a fresh manifestation of love. Love! Love! You can never love too much! The term *love* denotes the essence of the new principle. Then come its manifestations: first, in acts (*do good*); then in words (*bless*); lastly, the highest manifestation, which is at once act and word (*pray for*). These manifestations of love correspond with the exhibitions of hatred by which they are called forth: ἐχθρα, *hatred*, the inward feeling; μισεῖν, *to hold in abhorrence*, the acts; καταρασθαι, *to curse*, the words. Ἐπηρεάζειν (probably from ἐπί and αἴρεσθαι, *to rise against, to thwart*) corresponds with intercession. Jesus therefore here requires more than that which to natural selfishness appears the highest virtue: not to render evil for evil. He demands from His disciples, according to the expression of St. Paul (Rom. 12: 21), that they shall *overcome evil with good*; Jesus could not yet reveal the source whence His disciples were to derive this entirely new passion, this divine charity which displays its riches of forgiveness and salvation toward a rebellious world at enmity with God (Rom. 5: 8–10). In the parallel passage in Matthew, the two intervening propositions have probably been transferred from Luke.

Vers. 29 and 30.* *Patient Charity.*—"And unto him that smiteth thee on the one cheek, offer also the other; and him that taketh away thy cloak, forbid not to take thy coat also. 30. Give to every man that asketh of thee; and of him that taketh away thy goods ask them not again."—Paul also regards μακροθυμεῖν, *to be long-suffering*, as on a par with χρηστεύεσθαι, *to do good* (Charity suffereth long, and is kind. 1 Cor. 13: 4). The natural heart thinks it does a great deal when it respects a neighbor's rights; it does not rise to the higher idea of sacrificing its own. Jesus here describes a charity which seems to ignore its own rights, and knows no bounds to its self-sacrifice. He exhibits this sublime ideal in actual instances (*lit.* in the most concrete traits) and under the most paradoxical forms. In order to explain these difficult words, Olshausen maintained that they only applied to the members of the kingdom of God among themselves, and not to the relations of Christians with the world. But would Jesus have entertained the supposition of strikers and thieves among His own people? Again, it has been said that these precepts expressed nothing more than an emphatic condemnation of revenge (Calvin), that they were hyperboles (Zwingle), a portrayal of the general disposition which the Christian is to exemplify in each individual case, according as regard for God's glory and his neighbor's salvation may permit (Tholuck); which comes to St. Augustine's idea, that these precepts concern the *præparatio cordis* rather than the *opus quod in aperto fit*. Without denying that there is some truth in all these explanations, we think that they do not altogether grasp the idea. Jesus means that, as far as itself is concerned, charity knows no limits to its self-denial. If, therefore, it ever puts a stop to its concessions, it is in no way because it feels its patience exhausted; true charity is infinite as God Himself, whose essence it is. Its limit, if it has any, is not that which its rights draw around it; it is a limit like that which the beautiful defines for itself, proceeding from within. It is in charity that the disciple of Jesus yields, when he yields; it is in charity also that he resists, when he resists. *Charity has no other limit than Charity itself*, that is to say, it is boundless. Σιαγών does not properly mean, as it is ordinarily translated, the *cheek* (παρειά), but the *jaw*; the blow given,

* Ver. 29. ℵ. D., εις την for επι την. Ver. 30. ℵ. B. omit τω after παντι.

therefore, is not a slap, but a heavy blow. Consequently it is an act of violence, rather than of contempt, that is meant. The disciple who has completely sacrificed his person, naturally will not refuse his clothes. As ἱμάτιον denotes the upper garment, and χιτῶν the under garment or tunic which is worn next the skin, it would seem that here also it is an act of violence that is meant, a theft perpetrated by main force ; the thief first snatches away the upper garment. Matthew presents the reverse order : "He who would take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." This is because with him it is an affair of legal process (*if any man will sue thee at the law*). The creditor begins by possessing himself of the coat, which is less valuable ; then, if he is not sufficiently compensated, he claims the under garment. This juridical form stands connected in Matthew with the article of the Mosaic code which Jesus has just cited : *an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth.* Matthew, therefore, appears to have preserved the original words of this passage. But is it possible to conceive, that if Luke had had Matthew's writing before him, or the document made use of by the author of this Gospel, he would have substituted, on his own authority, a totally different thought from that of his predecessor ?

Ver. 30. Another form of the same thought. A Christian, so far as he is concerned, would neither refuse anything nor claim anything back. If, therefore, he does either one or the other, it is always out of charity. This sentiment regulates his refusals as well as his gifts, the maintenance as well as the sacrifice of his rights.

2*d*. After having described the applications of the new principle, Jesus gives a formal enunciation of it, ver. 31 : "And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise." The natural heart says, indeed, with the Rabbins : "What is disagreeable to thyself, do not do to thy neighbor." But charity says, by the mouth of Jesus : "Whatsoever thou desirest for thyself, that do to thy neighbor." Treat thy neighbor in everything as thine other self. It is obvious that Jesus only means desires that are reasonable and really salutary. His disciples are regarded as unable to form any others for themselves. Καί, *and*, may be rendered here by, *in a word*. In Matthew this precept is found in chap. 7, toward the end of the discourse, between an exhortation to prayer and a call to conversion, consequently without any natural connection with what precedes and follows. Notwithstanding this, Tholuck prefers the position which it has in Matthew. He regards this saying as a summary of the whole discourse (p. 498). But is it not manifest that it is more naturally connected with a series of precepts on charity, than with an exhortation to prayer ?

3*d*. The distinguishing characteristic of charity, disinterestedness : vers. 32–35*a*.* "And if ye love them which love you, what thank have ye ? For sinners also love those that love them. 33. And if ye do good to them which do good to you, what thank have ye ? For sinners also do even the same. 34. And if ye lend to those of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye ? For sinners also lend to sinners, to receive the same service. 35*a*. But love your enemies, and do them good, and lend, without hoping for anything again." Human love seeks an object which is congenial to itself, and from which, in case of need, it may obtain some return. There is always somewhat of self-interest in it. The new love which Jesus proclaims will be completely gratuitous and disinterested. For this reason it will be able to embrace even an object entirely opposed to its own nature. Χάρις : the favor which comes

* Ver. 33. ℵ* B. add γαρ between και and εαν. ℵ. B. Δ. omit γαρ after και. Ver. 34. Instead of απολαβειν, which is the reading of T. R. with 14 Mjj., ℵ. B. L. Z. read λαβειν. ℵ. B. L Z. omit γαρ. Ver. 35. ℵ. Z. Π. Syr., μηδεν instead of μηδεν.

P. J. LIBRARY K. C. K. BAP

from God; in Matthew: *τίνα μισθόν, what matter of recompense?* Ἀπολαμβάνειν τὰ ἴσα may signify, *to withdraw the capital lent*, or indeed, *to receive* some day *the same service*. The preposition *ἀπό* would favor the first sense. But the Alex. reading renders this prep. doubtful. The covert selfishness of this conduct comes out better in the second sense, only to lend to those who, it is hoped, will lend in their turn. It is a shrewd calculation, selfishness in instinctive accord with the law of retaliation, utilitarianism coming forward to reap the fruits of morality. What fine irony there is in this picture! What a criticism on natural kindness! The new principle of wholly disinterested charity comes out very clearly on this dark background of ordinary benevolence. This paradoxical form which Jesus gives His precepts effectually prevents all attempts of a relaxed morality to weaken them. Πλήν (ver. 35): "This false love cast aside; for you, my disciples, there only remains this." Ἀπελπίζειν means properly, *to despair*. Meyer would apply this sense here: "not despairing of divine remuneration in the dispensation to come." But how can the object of the verb *μηδέν, nothing*, be harmonized with this meaning and the antithesis in ver. 34? The sense which the Syriac translation gives, reading probably with some MSS. *μηδένα, no one*, "causing no one to despair by a refusal," is grammatically inadmissible. The only alternative is to give the *ἀπό* in *ἀπελπίζειν* the sense which this prep. already has in *ἀπολαβεῖν, hoping for nothing in return from* him who asks of you.

4th. The model and source of the charity which Jesus has just depicted: vers. 35*b* and 36.* "And your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest: for He is kind to the unthankful and to the evil. 36. Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful." Having referred to the love which His disciples are to surpass, that of man by nature a sinner, Jesus shows them what they must aspire to reach—that divine love which is the source of all gratuitous and disinterested love. The promise of a reward is no contradiction to the perfect disinterestedness which Jesus has just made the essential characteristic of love. And, in fact, the reward is not a payment of a nature foreign to the feeling rewarded, the prize of merit; it is the feeling itself brought to perfection, the full participation in the life and glory of God, who is love! Καί, *and in fact*. This disinterested love, whereby we become like God, raises us to the glorious condition of His sons and heirs, like Jesus Himself. The seventh beatitude in Matthew, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God," is probably a general maxim taken from this saying. If the ungrateful and the wicked are the object of divine love, it is because this love is compassionate (*οἰκτίρμων*, ver. 36). In the wicked man God sees the unhappy man. Matt. 5:45 gives this same idea in an entirely different form: "For He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." How could these two forms have been taken from the same document? If Luke had known this fine saying in Matthew, would he have suppressed it? Matthew concludes this train of thought by a general maxim similar to that in Luke 5:36: "Be ye therefore perfect, as your Father in heaven is perfect." These two different forms correspond exactly with the difference in the body of the discourse in the two evangelists. Matthew speaks of the inward righteousness, the perfection (to which one attains through charity); Luke, of charity (the essential element of perfection; comp. Col. 3:14).

* Ver. 36. ℵ. B. D. L. Z. It^{plerique} omit *οὖν*. ℵ. B. L. Z. omit *καί*.

5th. Love, the principle of all beneficent moral action on the world: vers. 37–45.— The disciples of Jesus are not only called to practise what is good themselves ; they are charged to make it prevail in the earth. They are, as Jesus says in Matthew, immediately after the beatitudes, *the light of the world, the salt of the earth.* Now they can only exercise this salutary influence through love, which manifests itself in this sphere also (comp. ver. 27), either by what it refrains from (vers. 37–42), or by action (vers. 43–45). Above all things, love refrains from judging.

Vers. 37 and 38.* "And judge not, and ye shall not be judged ; condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned ; forgive, and ye shall be forgiven. 38. Give, and it shall be given unto you ; good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom ; for with the same measure that ye mete withal, it shall be measured to you again." There is no reference here to the pardon of personal offences ; the reference is to charity, which, in a general way, refuses to judge. Jesus evidently has in view in this passage the judgment which the scribes and Pharisees assumed the right to exercise in Israel, and which their harshness and arrogance rendered more injurious than useful, as was seen in the effect it produced on the publicans and other such persons (5 : 30, 15 : 28–30). Καί indicates the transition to a new but analogous subject : *And further.* Κρίνειν, *to judge*, is not equivalent to *condemn ;* it means generally to set one's self up as a judge of the moral worth of another. But since, wherever this disposition prevails, judgment is usually exercised in an unkindly spirit, the word is certainly employed here in an unfavorable sense. It is strengthened by the following term : *condemn*, to condemn pitilessly, and without taking into account any reasons for forbearance. Ἀπολύειν, *to absolve*, does not refer, therefore, to the pardon of a personal offence ; it is the anxiety of love to find a neighbor innocent rather than guilty, to excuse rather than to condemn. The Lord does not forbid all moral judgments on the conduct of our neighbor ; this would contradict many other passages, for example, 1 Cor. 5 : 12 : "Do not ye judge them that are within ?" The true judgment, inspired by love, is implied in ver. 42. What Jesus desires to banish from the society of His disciples is the judging spirit, the tendency to place our faculty of moral appreciation at the service of natural malignity, or more simply still, judging for the pleasure of judging. The reward promised : *not to be judged or condemned, to be sent away absolved*, may refer either to this world or the other, to the conduct of men or of God. The latter is the more natural meaning, it enforces itself in the next precept. It is probably from here that the fifth beatitude in Matthew has been taken : "Blessed are the merciful ; for they shall obtain mercy."

With a disposition to absolve those that are accused is naturally connected that of giving, that is to say, of rendering service to all, even to the greatest sinners. This idea is introduced here only as an accessory to the other. There is some feeling in these successive imperatives, and a remarkable affluence of expression in the promise. Some one has said : "Give with a full hand to God, and He will give with a full hand to you." The idea of this boundless liberality of God is forcibly expressed by the accumulation of epithets. The measure, to which Jesus alludes, is one for solids (*pressed, shaken together*) ; the epithet, *running over*, is not at all op-

* Ver. 37. A. C. Λ. It$^{\text{aliq.}}$, *ινα μη* instead of *και ου μη*. Ver. 38. ℵ. B. D. L. Z., *ω γαρ μετρω* instead of *τω γαρ αυτω μετρω ω*, which is the reading of T. R. with all the other MSS.

posed to this. The expression, *into your bosom*, refers to the form of the oriental garment, which allows of things being heaped together in the large pocket-shaped fold above the girdle (Ruth 3 : 15). The plur. δώσουσιν, *they will give* corresponds to the French indef. pron. *on ;* it denotes the instruments of divine munificence, whoever they may be (12 : 20, 48). This precept is found, in very nearly the same terms, in Matt., 7 : 1 *et seq.*, immediately following an exhortation to confidence in Providence, and before an invitation to prayer—in a context, therefore, with which it has no connection. In Luke, on the contrary, all is closely connected.

Vers. 39 and 40. "And He spake a parable unto them, Can the blind lead the blind? Shall they not both fall into the ditch? 40. The disciple is not above his master: but every one that is perfect shall be as his master." Meyer, Bleek, and Holtzmann can see no natural connection between this little parable and the preceding precept. The form, *He said to them also*, seems of itself to indicate an interruption, and to betray the interpolation of a passage foreign to the original context. Is not, however, the figure of a blind man leading another man (ver. 39) evidently connected with that of the man who, while he has a beam in his own eye, wants to take a straw out of his brother's eye (ver. 41)? And who can fail to perceive the connection between the idea contained in this last illustration and the precept which precedes (vers. 37, 38) respecting judgments? A man's presuming to correct his neighbor, without correcting himself - is not this altogether characteristic of that mania for judging others which Jesus has just forbidden? The whole passage (vers. 37–42) is just, therefore, a piece of consecutive instruction respecting judgments. Jesus continues the contrast between that normal and salutary judgment which He expects from His disciples, in regard to the world, based partly on the love of one's neighbor, and partly on unsparing judgment of one's self, and that injurious judgment which the Pharisees, severe toward others, and altogether infatuated with themselves, were exercising in the midst of Jewish society. The sole result of the ministry of the Pharisees was to fit their disciples for the same perdition as themselves! Jesus prays His disciples not to repeat such achievements in the order of things which He is about to establish. In Matt. 15 : 14 and 23 : 15, 16 we have some precisely similar words addressed to the Pharisees. We are not mistaken, therefore, in our application of this figure. As to the phrase, *And He saith to them also* (ver. 39), comp. 6 : 5. This break in the discourse represents a moment's pause to collect His thoughts. Jesus seeks for an illustration that will impress His hearers with the deplorable consequences of passing judgment on others, when it is done after the fashion of the Pharisees. Ὁδηγεῖν, *to point out the way*, combines the two notions of correction and instruction. The disciple, in so far as he is a disciple, not being able to excel his master (ver. 40), it follows that the disciple of a Pharisee will not be able at best to do more than equal his master; that is to say, fall into the same ditch with him. Ver. 40 justifies this idea. Here we see what will happen to the whole people, if they remain under the direction of the Pharisees. The further they advance in the school of such masters, the nearer they will come . . . to perdition. The proverbial saying, ver. 40*a*, is used in Matt. 10 : 24, 25 and John 15 : 20 in this sense: The servants of Jesus must not expect to be treated better than their Master. In Luke 22 : 27 and John 13 : 16 it is applied to the humility which befits the servant of such a Master. It is obvious that Jesus made various applications of these general maxims. Whatever, then, modern criticism may think, the context of Luke is unexceptionable. How can Weizsäcker so disregard this connection as actually to

make ver. 39 the commencement of a new part, "the second section of the discourse!" (p. 153).

Vers. 41 and 42. "And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but perceivest not the beam that is in thine own eye? 42. Either how canst thou say to thy brother, Brother, let me pull out the mote that is in thine eye, when thou thyself beholdest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, cast out first the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to pull out the mote that is in thy brother's eye." In order to be useful in correcting another, a man must begin by correcting himself. Love, when sincere, never acts otherwise. Beyond the limits of this restraint, all judgment is the fruit of presumption and blindness. Such was the judgment of the Pharisees. The *mote*, the bit of straw which has slipped into the eye, represents a defect of secondary importance. A *beam* in the eye is a ludicrous image which ridicule uses to describe a ridiculous proceeding—a man's assuming, as the Pharisee did, to direct the moral education of his less vicious neighbor, when he was himself saturated with avarice, pride, and other odious vices. Such a man is rightly termed a hypocrite; for if it was hatred of evil that inspired his judgment, would he not begin by showing this feeling in an unsparing judgment of himself? Ordinarily, *διαβλέψεις* is understood in this sense: Thou wilt be able *to think to, to see to* . . . But can *βλέπειν, to see*, be used in this connection in an abstract sense? The connection between *ἐκβαλλε, take away*, and *διαβλέψεις, thou shalt see*, should suffice to prove the contrary: "Take away the beam which takes away thy sight, and then thou shalt see clearly to . . ." The verb *διαβλέπειν, to see through*, to see distinctly, is only found in this passage, and in its parallel in Matthew, in all the N. T. This has been held to prove that the two evangelists both employed the same Greek document. But characteristic expressions such as these doubtless originated in the first rendering of the oral tradition into the Greek tongue; precepts then took a fixed form, certain features of which were preserved in the preaching, and thence passed into our Syn.

In vers. 43–45, the idea of teaching, which is perceptible in ver. 40, takes the place altogether of the idea of judging, with which it is closely connected.

Vers. 43–45.* "For a good tree bringeth not forth corrupt fruit; neither doth a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. 44. For every tree is known by his own fruit: for of thorns men do not gather figs, nor of a bramble-bush gather they grapes." In order that our words may have a good influence on our neighbor, we must be good ourselves. In this passage, therefore, the fruits of the tree are neither the moral conduct of the individual who teaches, nor his doctrines. They are the results of his labor in others. In vain will a proud man preach humility, or a selfish man charity; the injurious influence of example will paralyze the efforts of their words. The *corrupt tree* (*σαπρόν*) is a tree infected with canker, whose juices are incapable of producing palatable fruit. The connection between vers. 43 and 44*a* is this: "This principle is so true, that every one, without hesitation, infers the nature of a tree from its fruits." In Palestine there are often seen, behind hedges of thorns and brambles, fig-trees completely garlanded with the climbing tendrils of vine branches.†

* Ver. 43. ℵ. B. L. Z. and several Mnn. add *παλιν* after *ουδε*. Ver. 45. ℵ. B. omit *αυτου* after *καρδιας*. ℵ. B. D. L. omit *ανθρωπος* after *πονησος*. ℵ. B. D. L. Z. omit the words *θησαυρου της καρδιας αυτου*.

† Konrad Furrer, "die Bedeutung der biblischen Geographie für die bibl. Exegese," p. 34.

Ver. 45 gives expression to the general principle on which the whole of the preceding rests. A man's word is the most direct communication of his being. If a man desires to reform others by his word, he must reform himself; then his word will change the world. Jesus Himself succeeded in depositing a germ of goodness in the world by His word alone, because He was a perfectly good man. It is for His disciples to continue His work by this method, which is the antipodes of that of the Pharisees. An analogous passage is found in Matthew, at the end of the Sermon on the Mount (7 : 15–20). There Jesus is exhorting His hearers to beware of false prophets, who betray their real character by their evil fruits. These false prophets may indeed be, in this precept, as in that of Luke, the Pharisees (comp. our ver. 26). But their fruits are certainly, in Matthew, their moral conduct, their pride, avarice, and hypocrisy, and not, as in Luke, the effects produced by their ministry. On the other hand, we find a passage in Matthew (12 : 33–35) still more like ours. As it belongs to a warning against blaspheming the Holy Ghost, the fruits of the tree are evidently, as in Luke, the words themselves, in so far as they are good or bad in their nature and in their effect on those who receive them. From this, is it not evident that this passage is the true parallel to ours, and that the passage which Matthew has introduced into the Sermon on the Mount is an importation, occasioned probably by the employment of the same image (that of the trees and their fruits) in both? Thus Jesus has risen by degrees from the conditions of the Christian life (the beatitudes) to the life itself; first of all to its principle, then to its action on the world. He has made His renewed disciples instruments for the renewal of humanity. It now only remains for Him to bring this inaugural discourse to a close.

Third part of the discourse: vers. 46–49. *The Sanction.*—Here we have the conclusion, and, so to speak, the peroration of the discourse. The Lord enjoins His disciples, for the sake of their own welfare, to put in practice the new principle of conduct which He has just laid down.

Ver. 46. "And why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say." This saying proves that Jesus was already recognized as Lord by a large part of this multitude, but that even then He would have been glad to find in many of those who saluted Him by this title a more scrupulous fidelity to the law of charity. This warning is connected, doubtless, with the preceding context, by this idea: "Do not be guilty, in the dispensation now commencing, of the same hypocrisy as the scribes and Pharisees have been guilty of in that which is coming to an end; they render homage to Jehovah, and, at the same time, perpetually transgress His law. Do not deal with my word in this way." The same idea is found in Matthew, at the corresponding place in the Sermon on the Mount (7 : 21 *et seq.*), but under that abstract and sententious form already observed in the Beatitudes: "Not every one that saith unto me: Lord, Lord," etc. In this passage in Matthew, Jesus expressly claims to be the Messiah and Supreme Judge. The same idea is expressed in the *Lord, Lord,* of Luke.

Vers. 47–49.* "Whosoever cometh to me, and heareth my sayings, and doeth them, I will show you to whom he is like: 48. He is like a man which built an house, and digged deep, and laid the foundation on a rock: and when the flood arose, the stream beat vehemently upon that house, and could not shake it; for it was

* Ver. 48. ℵ. B. L. Z., *δια το καλως οικοδομησθαι αυτην* instead of *τεθεμελιωτο γαρ επι την πετραν*, which is the reading of T. R. with all the other authorities. Ver. 49. C. and some Mnn., *οικοδομουντι* instead of *οικοδομησαντι*.

founded upon a rock. 49. But he that heareth, and doeth not, is like a man that, without a foundation, built a house upon the earth ; against which the stream did beat vehemently, and immediately it fell ; and the ruin of that house was great." The two evangelists coincide in this closing illustration. On the shelving lands which surround the Lake of Gennesareth, there are some hills on which the rock is covered with only a thin layer of earth (γῆ, Luke) or sand (ἄμμος, Matthew). A prudent man digs through this movable soil, digs deep down (ἐσκαψε καὶ ἐβάθυνε), even into the rock, upon and in which (ἐπί with the accusative) he lays the foundation. Luke only mentions one cause of destruction, the waterspout (πλήμμυρα), that breaks on the summit of the mountain and creates the torrents which carry away the layer of earth and sand, and with it the building that is not founded on the rock. Matthew adds the hurricane (ἄνεμοι) that ordinarily accompanies these great atmospheric disturbances, and overthrows the building which the torrent undermines. Though the differences between these two descriptions in Matthew and Luke are for the most part insignificant, they are too numerous to suppose that both could have been taken from the same document. To build on the earth is to admit the Lord's will merely into the understanding, that most superficial and impersonal part of a man's self, while closing the conscience against Him, and withholding the acquiescence of the will, which is the really personal element within us. The trial of our spiritual building is brought about by temptation, persecution, and, last of all, by judgment. Its overthrow is accomplished by unbelief here below, and by condemnation from above. The Alex. reading, *because it had been well built* (ver. 48), is to be preferred to that of the T. R., *for it was founded on a rock*, which is taken from Matthew. A single lost soul is a great ruin in the eyes of God. Jesus, in closing his discourse, leaves His hearers under the impression of this solemn thought. Each of them, while listening to this last word, might think that he heard the crash of the falling edifice, and say within himself : This disaster will be mine if I prove hypocritical or inconsistent.

The Sermon on the Mount, therefore, as Weizsäcker has clearly seen, is : the inauguration of the new law. The order of the discourse, according to the two documents, is this : Jesus addresses His hearers as belonging to a class of people who, even according to the Old Testament, have the greatest need of heavenly compensations. Treating them as disciples, either because they were already attached to Him as such, or in their character as voluntary hearers, He regards this audience, brought together without previous preparation, as representing the new order of things, and promulgates before this new Israel the principle of the perfect law. Then, substituting His disciples for the doctors of the ancient economy, He points out to them the sole condition on which they will be able to accomplish in the world the glorious work which He confides to them. Lastly, He urges them, in the name of all they hold most precious, to fulfil this condition by making their life agree with their profession, in order that, when tested by the judgment, they may not come to ruin. In what respect does this discourse lack unity and regular progression ? How can Weizsäcker say that these precepts, in Luke, are for the most part thrown together, without connection, and detached from their natural context ?* It is in Matthew rather, as Weizsäcker, among others, acknowledges, that we find foreign elements interwoven with the tissue of the discourse ; they are easily perceived, for they break the connection, and the association of ideas which has occasioned the interpolation is obvious. Thus, vers. 23–26, reconciliation (*apropos* of hatred and murder) ; vers. 29, 30, a precept, which is found elsewhere in Matthew itself (18 : 8, 9) ;

* "Untersuchungen," p. 154.

vers. 31 and 32 (a passage which is found 19 : 3–9) ; 6 : 7–15, the Lord's Prayer, an evident interruption in His treatment of the three principal Pharisaic virtues (alms, vers. 2–4 ; prayer, vers. 5, 6 ; fasting, vers. 16–18) ; 6 : 24 (if not even 19) –34, a passage on providence (in connection with the avarice of the Pharisees) ; 7 : 6–11, and 13, 14, precepts, simply juxtaposited ; 7 : 15–20, a passage for which 12 : 33–35 should be substituted ; lastly, 7 : 22, 23, where allusion is made to facts which lie out of the horizon of that early period. It is remarkable that these passages, whose foreign character is proved by the context of Matthew, are the very passages that are found dispersed over different places in the Gospel of Luke, where their appropriateness is easily verified. The author of the first Gospel could not be blamed for this combination of heterogeneous elements within one and the same outline, unless his compilation of the discourse had been made from the first with an historical aim. But if we admit, as we are authorized by the testimony of Papias to admit, that this discourse belonged originally to a collection of discourses compiled with a didactic or liturgical aim, and that the author wanted to give a somewhat complete exposition of the new moral law proclaimed by Jesus, there is nothing more natural than this agglomerating process. It is evident that the author found, in this way, a means of producing in his readers, just as any other evangelist, the thrilling impression which the word of Jesus had made on the hearts of His hearers (Matt. 7 : 28, 29). The way in which these two versions stand related to each other, will not allow of their being deduced from a proto-Mark as a common source, according to Holtzmann and Weizsäcker. And besides, how, in this case, did it happen that this discourse was omitted in our canonical Mark ? The species of *logophobia* which they attribute to him, in order to explain this fact, is incompatible with Mark 9 : 39–51, and 13.

A religious party has made a party-banner of this discourse. According to them, this discourse is a summary of the teaching of Jesus, who merely spiritualized the Mosaic law. But how are we to harmonize with this view the passages in which Jesus makes attachment to His person the very centre of the new righteousness (*for my sake*, Matt. 5 : 11 ; *for the sake of the Son of man*, Luke 6 : 22), and those in which He announces Himself as the Final and Supreme Judge (Matt. 7 : 21–23, comp. with Luke 6 : 46 : *Lord, Lord !*) ? The true view of the religious import of this discourse, is that which Gess has expressed in these well-weighed words : " The Sermon on the Mount describes that earnest piety which no one can cultivate without an increasing feeling of the need of redemption, by means of which the righteousness required by such piety may at last be realized" (p. 6).

2. *The Centurion's Servant :* 7 : 1–10.—This was the most striking instance of faith that Jesus had met with up to this time ; and what was more astonishing, He was indebted for this surprise to a Gentile. Jesus instantly perceives the deep significance of this unexpected incident, and cautiously indicates it in ver. 9, while in Matt. 8 : 11, 12 it is expressed with less reserve. We should have expected the reverse, according to the dogmatic prepossessions which criticism imputes to our evangelists. It is obliged, therefore, to have recourse to the hypothesis of subsequent interpolations.

This cure is connected, in Matthew as well as in Luke, with the Sermon on the Mount. This resemblance in no way proves, as some think, a common written source. For, 1. The two passages are separated in Matthew by the healing of the leper, which Luke assigns to another time ; 2. The narratives of the two evangelists present very considerable differences of detail ; lastly, 3. There was nothing to prevent certain groups of narrative, more or less fixed, being formed in the oral teaching of the gospel, which passed in this way into our written narratives. As to Mark, he omits this miracle, an omission difficult to account for, if he copied Matthew and Luke (Bleek), and equally difficult if, with them, he derived his narrative from an original Mark (Ewald and Holtzmann). Holtzmann (p. 78), with Ewald, thinks that " if he cut out the Sermon on the Mount, he might easily omit also the passage which follows, and which opens a new section." But on other occasions it is asserted that

Mark purposely omits the discourses, to make room for facts. Now, are we not here concerned with a fact? Bleek does not even attempt to explain this omission.

Vers. 1–6*a*.* *The First Deputation.*—The Alex. reading ἐπειδή, *since assuredly*, has no meaning. There is something solemn in these expressions: ἐπλήρωσε, *had fulfilled*, and εἰς τὰς ἀκοάς, *in the ears of the people*. The proclamation which had just taken place is given as something complete. The circumstance that this miracle took place just when Jesus returned to Capernaum, after this discourse, was remembered in the traditional account, and has been faithfully preserved in our two evangelical narratives. The centurion (ver. 2) was probably a Roman soldier in the service of Herod; he was a proselyte, and had even manifested special zeal on behalf of his new faith (ver. 5). Instead of δοῦλος, *a slave*, Matthew says παῖς, a word which may signify either a *son* or a *servant*, and which Luke employs in the latter sense at ver. 7. Bleek and Holtzmann prefer the meaning *son* in Matthew, because otherwise it would be necessary to admit that the centurion had only one slave." As if a man could not say: "My servant is sick," though he had several servants! The meaning *servant* is more probable in Matthew, because it better explains the reluctance which the centurion feels to trouble the Lord. If it had been his son, he would doubtless have been bolder. The malady must have been, according to Matthew's description, ver. 6, acute rheumatism. And whatever criticism may say, this malady, when it affects certain organs, the heart for instance, may become mortal. The words: *who was very dear to him*, serve to explain why a step so important as a deputation of the elders should have been taken. The latter are doubtless the rulers of the synagogue, whose duty it was to maintain order in the congregation. They could more easily explain to Jesus the honorable facts which made in favor of the centurion, than he could himself.

Vers. 6*b*–8.† *The Second Deputation.*—The centurion, from his house, sees Jesus approaching with His retinue of disciples. The veneration with which this mysterious person inspires him makes him afraid even to receive Him under his roof; he sends, therefore, a second deputation. Strauss sees in this a contradiction of his former proceeding. But it was simply a deeper humility and stronger faith that had dictated this course. Ἱκανός here denotes *moral worth*, as in 3 : 16 and elsewhere. Faith vies with humility in this man. The expression εἰπὲ λόγῳ, *say in a word*, suggests this means in preference to His coming in person. In Matthew's narrative all these proceedings are united in a single act; the centurion comes himself to tell Jesus of the sickness, and to the offer of Jesus to visit his house, returns the answer which we find in Luke 5 : 8.‡ Bleek regards the details in Luke as an amplification of the original narrative; others consider Matthew's account an abridgment of Luke's. But how could Luke exaggerate in this way the plain statement of Matthew, or Matthew mangle the description of Luke? Our evangelists were earnest believers. All that tradition had literally preserved was the characteristic reply of the centurion (ver. 8), and our Lord's expression of admiration (ver 9). The historical outline had been

* Ver. 1. A. B. C. X. Π., επειδη instead of επει δε.

† Ver. 6. B. L., εκατονταρχης instead of εκατονταρχος. ℵ* B. omit προς αυτον. Ver. 7. B. L., ιαθητω instead of ιαθησεται.

‡ What can be more natural than the reporting that as said by one's self which is said by an authorized deputation, where the object of the writer is to condense? This is what Matthew has done. "He does that which is done, though it be done by another for him." See a parallel case in Matt. 20 : 20, compared with Mark 10 : 35.—J. H.

created with greater freedom in the oral narration. This explains in a very natural manner the difference between our two narratives. Although he was only an ordinary man (ἄνθρωπος), and a man in a dependent position, the centurion had some subordinates through whom he could act without always going himself to the place. Could not Jesus, who stood far above him in the hierarchy of being, having the powers of the invisible world at His disposal, make use, if He pleased, of a similar power? We may compare here Jesus' own words respecting the angels which ascend and descend (John 1 : 52). How are we to explain the existence of such faith in this man? We must bear in mind the words of ver. 3 : *having heard of Jesus.* The fame of the miracles of Jesus had reached even him. There was one cure especially, which Jesus had wrought at Capernaum itself, and since Cana, which presented a remarkable similarity to that which the centurion besought—the cure of the nobleman's son (John 4). Perhaps his knowledge of this miracle is the most natural mode of explaining the faith implied in the message which he addresses to Jesus by the mouth of his friends. The expression, *such faith,* refers not to the request for a cure, but for a cure without the aid of His bodily presence. It was, as it were, a paroxysm of faith!

Vers. 9 and 10.* *The Cure.*—The severe words respecting the Jews, which in Matthew Jesus adds to the praise bestowed on the centurion's faith, seem to prove that Matthew makes use of a different source of information from Luke's. These words are found, in fact, in Luke in a totally different connection (13 : 28), at a more advanced period, when they are certainly more appropriate.

Several ancient and modern critics identify this cure with that of the nobleman's son (John 4). The differences, however, are considerable : † here we have a soldier of Gentile origin, there a courtier of Jewish origin ; here the place is Capernaum, there Cana ; here we have a man who in his humility is reluctant that Jesus should enter his house, there a man who comes a long way seeking Jesus that he may induce Him to go with him to his home ; lastly, and in our view this difference is most decisive, here we have a Gentile given as an example to all Israel, there a Jew, whose conduct furnishes occasion for Jesus to throw a certain amount of blame on all his Galilean fellow-countrymen. In truth, if these two narratives referred to the same fact, the details of the Gospel narratives would no longer deserve the least credence. According to Keim, the miracle is to be explained, on the one hand, by the faith of the centurion and the sick man, which already contained certain healing virtues, and on the other, by the moral power of the word of Jesus, which word was something between a wish and a command, and completed the restoration. But does not this ethico-psychical mode of action require the presence of him who effects a cure in this way? Now this presence is unmistakably excluded here in both narratives by the prayer of the centurion, and by this word of Jesus : *so great faith!* And what is this something between a wish and a command?

3. *The Son of the Widow of Nain :* 7 : 11–17.—The following narrative is one of those which clearly reveal our Lord's tenderness of heart, and the power which human grief exerted over Him. The historical reality of this fact has been objected to on the ground that it is only related by Luke. Criticism always reasons as if the evangelists were swayed by the same historical prepossessions as itself. The life of

* Ver. 10. ℵ. B. L. It^{plerique}, omit ασθενουντα before δουλον.

† This difference is well stated in the admirable work of Trench on "The Miracles," p. 127 (7th edition)—a book which, with that on "The Parables," readers who, like Sabbath-school teachers, wish to have the meaning of the Gospels, will find most valuable—J. H.

Jesus presented such a rich store of miraculous incidents that no one ever dreamed of giving a complete record of them. Jesus alludes to miracles performed at Chorazin, none of which are related in our Gospels. With a single exception, we are equally ignorant of all that were wrought at Bethsaida. It is very remarkable that, among all the miracles which are indicated summarily in our Gospels (4 : 23, 40, 41, 6 : 18, 19 and parall., 7 : 21, etc. ; John 2 : 23, 4 : 45, 6 : 1, 20 : 30, 21 ! 25), one or two only of each class are related in detail. It appears that the most striking example of each class was chosen, and that from the first no attempt was made to preserve any detailed account of the others. For edification, which was the sole aim of the popular preaching, this was sufficient. Ten cures of lepers would say no more to faith than one. But it might happen that some of the numerous miracles passed over by the tradition, came, through private sources of information, to the knowledge of one of our evangelists, and that he inserted them in his work. Thus, under the category of resurrections, the raising of Jairus' daughter had taken the foremost place in the tradition—it is found in the three Syn.—while other facts of the kind, such as that before us, had been left in the background, without, however, being on that account denied.

Vers. 11 and 12.* *The Meeting.*—The reading ἐν τῷ ἑξῆς (*χρόνῳ*), *in the following time*, does not connect this narrative so closely with the preceding as the reading ἐν τῇ ἑξῆς (*ἡμέρᾳ*), *the following day*. This is a reason for preferring the former ; it is only natural that the more precise should be substituted for the less definite connection. Robinson found a hamlet named Nein to the south-west of Capernaum, at the northern foot of the little Hermon. It is in this locality, moreover, that Eusebius and Jerome place the city of Nain. Jesus would only have to make a day's journey to reach it from Capernaum. Josephus (Bell. Jud. iv. 9. 4) mentions a city of Nain, situated on the other side of Jordan, in the south part of the Peræa ; and Köstlin, relying on the expressions in ver. 17, applied this name to this town in the immediate neighborhood of Judæa, and thought that Luke's narrative must have come from a Judæan source. But we shall see that ver. 17 may be explained without having recourse to this supposition, which is not very natural. The καὶ ἰδού, *and behold*, expresses something striking in the unexpected meeting of the two processions—the train which accompanied the Prince of Life, and that which followed the victim of death. This seems to be expressed also by the relation of ἱκανοί in ver. 11 to ἱκανός in ver. 12. The first of these words has been omitted by many MSS., because the expression : *his disciples*, appeared to refer to the apostles alone. At ver. 12 the construction is Aramæan. The dative τῇ μητρί expresses all the tenderness of the relationship which had just been severed.

Vers. 13–15.† *The Miracle.*—The expression : *the Lord*, is seldom met with in our Gospels except in Luke, and principally in the passages which are peculiar to him : 10 : 1, 11 : 39, 12 : 42, 13 : 15, 17 : 5, 6, 18 : 6, 22 : 31, 61 (Bleek). The whole circumstances enumerated ver. 12 : an only son, a widowed mother, and the public sympathy, enable us to understand what it was that acted with such power upon the heart of Jesus. It seems that He could not resist the silent appeal presented by this com-

* Vers. 11–14. Mjj. 70 Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ read, εν τω εξης instead of εν τη εξης, which is the reading of T. R. with ℵ. C. D. K. M. S. Π. many Mnn. Syr. It$^{aliq.}$ ℵ. B. D. F. L. Z. Syr$^{sch.}$. It^{plerique}, omit ικανοι. Ver. 12. 7 Mjj. add ην after αυτη. ℵ. B. L. Z. add ην before συν αυτη.

† Ver. 13. The MSS. vary between επ' αυτη and επ' αυτην.

bination of circumstances. His heart is completely subdued by the sobs of the mother. Hence the word, at once tender and authoritative: *Weep not.* Prudence perhaps would have dictated that He should not work such a striking miracle at this time. But when pity speaks so loud (ἐσπλαγχνίσθη), there is no longer any room for prudence. Besides, He feels Himself authorized to comfort. For in this very meeting He recognizes the will of His Father. Among the Jews the bier was not covered; it was a simple plank, with a somewhat raised edge. The body, wrapped in its shroud, was therefore visible to all. Jesus lays His hand on the bier, as if to arrest this fugitive from life. The bearers, struck by the majesty of this gesture, which was at once natural and symbolical, stopped. There is a matchless grandeur in this σοὶ λέγω: "I say to thee, . . . to thee who seemest no longer able to hear the voice of the living . . ." There is absolutely nothing in the text to justify the sarcasm of Keim: "Faith in a force which penetrates to the dead, even through the wood of the bier, evidently belongs to the evangelist, but it is not ours." The resurrection is in no way attributed to the touching of the bier, but to the command of Jesus. The interruption of the connection between the soul and the body in death, as in sleep, is only relative; and as man's voice suffices to re-establish this connection in any one who is rapt in slumber, so the word of the Lord has power to restore this interrupted connection even in the dead. The advocates of the natural interpretation have maintained that the young man was only in a lethargic sleep. But if this were so, the miracle of power would only disappear to be replaced by a miracle of knowledge quite as incomprehensible. How could Jesus know that this apparently dead man was still living, and that the moment of his awaking was imminent?* As soon as the soul returned to animate the body, motion and speech indicated its presence. Jesus certainly has acquired a right over the resuscitated man; He asserts this right, but simply to enjoy the happiness of restoring to the afflicted mother the treasure which He has rescued from death. The expression: *He gave him to his mother*, corresponds to this: *He was moved with compassion*, ver. 13.

Vers. 16, 17. † *The Effect produced.*—On the feeling of fear, see chap. 5 : 8. *A great prophet:* a greater than John the Baptist himself, a prophet of the first rank, such as Elijah or Moses. The second expression: *God hath visited . . .* is more forcible still; it suggests more than it expresses. The expression: *this saying* [*this rumor*, A. V.], might be referred to the fame of the miracle which was immediately spread abroad. But the words περὶ αὐτοῦ, *concerning Him*, which depend, as in ver. 15, on λόγος οὗτος, rather incline us to refer this expression to the two preceding exclamations (ver. 16): "This manner of thinking and speaking about Jesus spread abroad." It is an indication of progress in the development of the work of Jesus. In order to explain *into Judæa*, Keim (i. p. 72) unceremoniously says: Luke just makes Nain a city of Judæa. But the term ἐξῆλθεν, literally: *went out*, signifies the very contrary; it intimates that these sayings, *after having filled Galilee* (their first sphere, understood without express mention), this time passed beyond this natural

* Zeller ("Apostelgesch." p. 177) replies with some smartness to this ancient rationalistic explanation. "In order to admit it," he says, "it must be thought credible that, within the short period embraced by the evangelical and apostolic history, there took place five times over, thrice in the Gospels and twice in the Acts, this same circumstance, this same remarkable chance of a lethargy, which, though unperceived by those who were engaged about the dead, yields to the first word of the divine messenger, and gives rise to a belief in a real resurrection."

† Ver. 16. A. B. C. L. Z., ηγερθη for εγηγερται.

limit, and resounded as far as the country of Judæa, where they filled every mouth. There is no necessity, therefore, to give the word Judæa here the unusual meaning of the entire Holy Land, as Meyer and Bleek do. The reason why this detail is added, is not in any way what Köstlin's acute discernment surmised in order to build upon it the critical hypothesis that the narrative is of Judæan origin. These words are intended to form the transition to the following passage. John was in prison in the south of the Holy Land, in the neighborhood of Judæa (in Peræa, in the castle of Machærus, according to Josephus). The fame of the works of Jesus, therefore, only reached him in his prison by passing through Judæa. The words : *and throughout all the region round about*, which refer especially to the Peræa, leave no doubt as to the intention of this remark of Luke. It forms the introduction to the following narrative.

There is a difficulty peculiar to this miracle, owing to the absence of all moral receptivity in the subject of it. Lazarus was a believer , in the case of the daughter of Jairus, the faith of the parents to a certain extent supplied the place of her personal faith. But here there is nothing of the kind. The only receptive element that can be imagined is the ardent desire of life with which this young man, the only son of a widowed mother, had doubtless yielded his last breath. And this, indeed, is sufficient. For it follows from this, that Jesus did not dispose of him arbitrarily. And as to faith, many facts prove that not in any miracle is it to be regarded as a dynamical factor, but only as a simple moral condition related to the spiritual aim which Jesus sets before Himself in performing the wonderful work.

Keim, fully sensible of the incompetency of any psychological explanation to account for such a miracle, has recourse to the mythical interpretation of Strauss in his first "Life of Jesus." We are supposed to have here an imitation of the resurrection of dead persons in the Old Testament, particularly of that wrought by Elisha at Shunem, which is only a short league from Nain. These continual changes of expedients, with a view to get rid of the miracles, are not calculated to recommend rationalistic criticism. And we cannot forbear reminding ourselves here of what Baur urged with so much force against Strauss on the subject of the resurrection of Lazarus : that a myth that was a creation of the Christian consciousness must have been generally diffused, and not have been found in only one of our Gospels. Invention by the author (and consequently imposture) or history, is the only alternative.

From the omission of this miracle in Matthew and Mark, the advocates of the opinion that a proto-Mark was the common source of the Syn., conclude that this narrative was wanting in the primitive document, and that Luke added it from special sources. But if this were only a simple intercalation of Luke's, his narrative would coincide immediately afterward with those of Mark and Matthew. Unfortunately there is no such coincidence. Matthew, after the cure of the centurion's servant, relates the cure of Peter's mother-in-law, and a number of incidents which have nothing in common with those which follow in Luke. And Mark, who has already omitted the preceding fact, although it should have been found, according to this hypothesis, in the proto-Mark—for that is where Matthew must have taken it from —does not fall, after this omission, into the series of facts related by Luke. After the day of the Sermon on the Mount, he places a series of incidents which have no connection with those that follow in Luke. And yet the boast is made, that the dependence of the three Syn. on a primitive Mark has been shown to demonstration ! As to Bleek, who makes Mark depend on the other two, he does not even attempt to

explain how Mark, having Luke before his eyes, omitted incidents of such importance.

4. *The Deputation from John the Baptist:* 7 : 18–35.—This incident, related only by Matthew (chap. 11) and Luke, and by them differently placed, is in both accounted for in the same manner. The fame of the works of Jesus reached even John. If Luke does not expressly say, as Matthew does, that the forerunner was in prison, it is because, whatever Bleek may say, this position of affairs was sufficiently known from the remark, 3 : 19, 20. But how should the fame of the miracles of Jesus, of *the works of the Christ* (Matthew), awaken in his mind the doubt which his question appears to imply? Strauss has maliciously expressed his surprise that no manufacturer of conjectures has as yet proposed to substitute in Matthew : *οὐκ ἀκούσας, not having heard*, for *ἀκούσας, having heard.* But this apparent contradiction is the very key to the whole incident. Most assuredly John does not doubt whether Jesus is a divine messenger, for he interrogates Him. He does not appear even to deny Him all participation in the Messianic work : "John having heard in his prison of the works of the Christ" (Matthew). What he cannot understand is just this, that these works of the Christ are not accompanied by the realization of all the rest of the Messianic programme which he had formerly proclaimed himself, and especially by the theocratic judgment. "His fan is in his hand . . . the axe is already laid at the root of the trees." Jesus in no way recognizes it as His duty to become the Messiah-judge whom John had announced in such solemn terms, and whose expected coming had so unsettled the people. On the contrary, He said : "I am come not to judge, but to save" (John 3 : 17). This contrast between the form of the Messianic work as it was being accomplished by Jesus, and the picture which John had drawn of it himself, leads him to inquire whether the Messianic work was to be divided between two different persons—the one, Jesus, founding the kingdom of God in the heart by His word and by miracles of benevolence; the other commissioned to execute the theocratic judgment, and by acts of power to build up on the earth the national and social edifice of the kingdom of God. This is the real meaning of John's question : "Should we look for [not properly *another*, but] a different one (*ἕτερον* in Matthew, and perhaps in Luke also)?" We know in fact that several divine messengers were expected. Might not Jesus be that prophet whom some distinguished from the Christ (9 : 19); John 1 : 20, 21, 25), but whom others identified with Him (John 6 : 14, 15)? Doubtless, if this was the thought of the forerunner, it indicated weakness of faith, and Jesus characterizes it as such (*is offended in Him*, ver. 23). But there is nothing improbable in it. Not without reason had John said concerning himself : "He that is of the earth speaketh as being of the earth" (John 3 : 31); and Jesus, that he was less than the least of believers. Such alternations between wonderful exaltation and deep and sudden depression are characteristic of all the men of the old covenant; lifted for a moment above themselves, but not as yet inwardly renewed, they soon sank back to their natural level. There is no need, therefore, to have recourse to the hypothesis of Chrysostom, accepted by Calvin, Grotius, etc., that John desired to give his disciples an opportunity to convince themselves of the dignity of Jesus, or to suppose, with Hase, that John's design was to stimulate Jesus, and accelerate the progress of His work. These explanations do not correspond with either the letter or the spirit of the text.

This portion comprises : 1*st*, the question of John, and the reply of Jesus, vers. 18–23; 2*d*, the discourse of Jesus upon the person and ministry of John, vers. 24–35.

1*st.* Vers. 18–23 : *The Question and the Reply.*

Vers. 18 and 19.* *The Question.*—Thus far, according to Holtzmann (pp. 135, 145), Luke had followed the first of his sources, the proto-Mark (*A.*) ; now he leaves it to make use of the second (of which the author of our Matthew has also availed himself), the Logia or discourses of Matthew (A). The expression : ὁ ἐρχόμενος, *He who cometh*, is taken from Malachi (3 : 1) : " Behold, He cometh, saith the Lord." The reading ἕτερον, which is certain in Matthew, is probable in Luke. This pronoun, taken in its strict meaning : *a second*, attributes to Jesus in any case the office of the Christ.

Vers. 20–23.† *The Reply.*—As Matthew does not mention the miracles which were wrought, according to Luke, in the presence of John's messengers, criticism has suspected the latter of having invented this scene himself. This conclusion is logical if it be admitted that he makes use of Matthew, or of the same document as Matthew. But by what right are such charges preferred against a historian whose narrative indicates at every step the excellence of his own information, or of the sources upon which he drew ? Do we not see Matthew continually abridging his historical outline, in order to give the fullest possible report of the words of Jesus ? In the present case, do not the words : " Go, tell John what ye do see and hear," imply the historical fact which Matthew omits ? It is precisely because the word implied the fact, that this evangelist thought he might content himself with the former. The demonstrative force of Jesus' reply appears not only from the miracles, but still more from the connection between these facts and the signs of the Messiah, as foretold in the Old Testament (Isa. 35 : 4, 5, 61 : 1 *et seq.*). Jesus does not mention the cure of demoniacs, because, perhaps, no mention is made of them in the O. T. Neander and Schweitzer take the words : *the dead are raised up*, in a figurative sense. Keim thinks that the evangelists have taken all these miracles in the literal sense, but that Jesus understood them in the spiritual sense . the people, blinded by the Pharisees, gain knowledge ; the publicans (the lepers) are cleansed from their defilement, etc. The works of the Christ should be understood in the same spiritual sense (his instructions and missionary efforts). But the spiritual fruits of the ministry of Jesus are not facts which fall under the cognizance of the senses. " What ye do see and hear" can only denote bodily cures and resurrections, which they either witness or have related. The preaching of the gospel is intentionally placed at the end ; it is the characteristic feature of the Messianic work, as it was being accomplished by Jesus, in opposition to the idea which John had formed of it. Jesus, at the same time, thereby reminds His forerunner of Isa. 61 : 1. These words form the transition to the warning of the 23d verse : " Blessed is he who shall not be offended in me," who shall not ask for any other proof than those of my Messianic dignity ; who shall not, in the humble, gentle, and merciful progress of my work, despise the true characteristics of the promised Christ ! Isaiah had said of the Messiah (8 : 14) : " He shall be for a stone of stumbling ; and many among them shall stumble and fall." It is this solemn warning of which Jesus reminds both John and his disciples, as well as the people who witnessed the scene ; σκανδαλισθῆναι · *to hurt one's self by stumbling.* To what a height Jesus here soars above the greatest representative of the past ! But,

* Ver. 19. B. L. R Z. some Mnn. It$^{\text{aliq.}}$, κυριον instead of Ιησουν. ℵ. B. L. R. X. Z. 16 Mnn., ετερον instead of αλλον.

† Ver. 20. ℵ. B., απεστειλεν instead of απεσταλκεν. ℵ. B. D. L. Z. 12 Mnn., ετερον instead of αλλον. Ver. 21. ℵ. B. L. some Mnn., εκεινη instead of αυτη. ℵ. L., ημερα instead of ωρα. Ver. 22. ℵ. B. D. Z. omit ο Ιησους.

at the same time, what sincerity is manifested by the sacred authors, who do not fear to exhibit in the clearest light the infirmities of their most illustrious heroes!

2*d*. Vers. 24–35. *The Discourse of Jesus.*—Jesus had a debt to discharge. John had borne striking testimony to Him; He avails Himself of this occasion to pay public homage in His turn to His forerunner. He would not allow this opportunity to pass without doing it, because there was a strict solidarity between John's mission and His own. This discourse of Jesus concerning John is, as it were, the funeral oration of the latter; for he was put to death soon after. Jesus begins by declaring the importance of John's appearing (vers. 24–28); he next speaks of the influence exerted by his ministry (vers. 29, 30); lastly, He describes the conduct of the people under these two great divine calls—John's ministry and His own (vers. 31–35). The same general order is found in Matt. 11; 1*st*. vers. 7–11; 2*d*, vers. 12–15; 3*d*, vers. 16–20.

Vers. 24–28.* *The Importance of John's Appearing*—"And when the messengers of John were departed, He began to speak unto the people concerning John: What went ye out into the wilderness to see? A reed shaken with the wind? 25. But what went ye out for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? Behold, they which are gorgeously apparelled, and live delicately, are in kings' courts. 26. But what went ye out for to see? A prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet. 27. This is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before Thy face, which shall prepare Thy way before Thee. 28. For I say unto you, Among those that are born of women, there is not a greater [prophet] than John the Baptist: but he that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he." Ἐρξατο, *He began to*, as 4 : 21; this term intimates the solemnity of the discourse which it introduces. The people themselves, by crowding to the baptism of John, showed that they recognized him as an extraordinary person; and they were right. Is the reed shaken by the wind an emblem here of moral instability? The meaning in this case would be: "Yes, John is really as vacillating as a reed" (Ewald); or else: "No, you must not draw this conclusion from what has just taken place" (Meyer, Neander, Bleek). But this reed shaken by the wind may be regarded simply as the emblem of something of ordinary, every-day occurrence. "It was not certainly to behold something which may be seen every day that you flocked to the desert." The verb ἐξελθεῖν, *to go out*, expresses the great commotion caused by such a pilgrimage. The perf ἐξεληλύθατε signifies: "What impression have you retained from what you went to see" while the aor. (Alex.) would signify: "What motive induced you to go . . ." Tischendorf acknowledges that the perf. is the true reading. The aor. is taken from Matthew. The verb θεάσασθαι depends on ἐξεληλύθατε, and must not be joined to the following proposition: they went out in search of a spectacle. This expression reminds us of the saying of Jesus (John 5 : 35): "John was a burning and a shining light: and ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light." In any case, therefore, John is something great—the popular opinion is not deceived here. But

* Ver. 24. The MSS. are divided between προς τους οχλους and τους οχλους. Vers. 24 and 25. Instead of εξεληλυθατε, which is the reading of T. R. with 12 Mjj. and the greater part of the Mnn., ℵ. A. B. D. L. X. and some Mnn. read εξηλθατε; K. Π. 30 Mnn., εξηλθετε. Ver. 26. Just as vers. 24 and 25, except with A. K. Π., which here read εξεληλυθατε with T. R. Ver. 27. ℵ. B. D. L. X. some Mnn. It. omit εγω after ιδου. Ver. 28. B. Z., λεγω; ℵ. L. X., αμην λεγω instead of λεγω γαρ, which is the reading of T. R. with 13 Mjj. and the Mnn. ℵ. B. K. L. M. X. Z. Π. 25 Mnn. It$^{\text{plerique}}$, omit προφητης, which is the reading of T. R. with 10 Mjj. It$^{\text{aliq}}$. Syr$^{\text{sch}}$. ℵ. B. L. X. omit του Βαπτιστου.

there are two kinds of greatness — earthly greatness, and heavenly. Of which is John's? If it had been, Jesus continues, of an earthly nature, John would not have dwelt in a wilderness, but in a palace. His greatness, therefore, was of a divine order. But, according to Jewish opinion, all greatness of this kind consists in a prophetic mission. Hence the conclusion at which the people arrived respecting John, which Jesus begins by confirming, "Yea, I say unto you;" and then going beyond this, *and more than a prophet.* Is it not greater, indeed, to be the subject of prediction than to predict—to figure, in the picture of the Messianic times, as a person foreseen by the prophets, than one's self to hold the prophetic glass? This is why John is more than a prophet: his appearing is a γεγραμμένον, an event *written.*

The quotation from Mal. 3 : 1 is found in the three Syn.; in Matthew, in the parallel passage (11 : 10); in Mark (1 : 2), at the opening of the Gospel, but with this difference, that he omits the words, *before Thee.* On the ἐγώ, *I* (after ἰδού), the various readings do not permit us to pronounce. This general agreement is remarkable; for the quotation is identical neither with the Hebrew text nor with the LXX. Neither Malachi nor the LXX. have the words, *before my face,* in the proposition; but in the second, the former says, *before me,* and the latter, *before my face.* Further, the LXX. read ἐξαποστελλω instead of ἀποστέλλω, and ἐμβλέψεται instead of κατασκευάσει. This might be an argument in favor of a common written source, or of the use of one of the Syn. by the rest; but it would not be decisive. For, 1. If the common source is the Proto-Mark, how could Mark himself place this quotation in quite a different context? 2. If it is the Logia, why does Mark, instead of simply copying it, omit the words, *before Thee?* 3. It would be just the same if Mark copied one of the other Syn. 4. Neither do these copy Mark, which does not contain the discourse. The coincidences in the Syn. must therefore be explained in a different way. The substitution in Luke and Matthew of *before Thee* for *before me* (in Malachi), results from the way in which Jesus Himself had cited this passage. In the prophet's view, He who was sending, and He before whom the way was to be prepared, were one and the same person, Jehovah. Hence the *before me* in Malachi. But for Jesus, who, in speaking of Himself, never confounds Himself with the Father, a distinction became necessary. It is not Jehovah who speaks of Himself, but Jehovah speaking to Jesus; hence the form *before Thee.* From which evidence, does it not follow from this quotation that, in the prophet's idea, as well as in that of Jesus, Messiah's appearing is the appearing of Jehovah? (See Gess, pp. 39, 40.) As to the other expressions in common, Weizsäcker correctly explains them by saying that, since "this quotation belonged to the Messianic demonstration in habitual use," it acquired in this way the fixed form under which we find it in our Syn.

The *for,* ver. 28, refers to the words, *of whom it is written.* The person whose lot it has been to be mentioned along with the Messiah, must be of no ordinary distinction. The T. R., with the Byz. Mjj. reads: "I say unto you, that among them which are born of woman, there hath arisen no greater prophet than John the Baptist." The Alex. omit the word prophet, and rightly; for there is tautology. Is not every prophet born of woman? The superiority of John over all other theocratic and human appearances, refers not to his personal worth, but to his position and work. Did his inward life surpass that of Abraham, Elijah, etc. . . .? Jesus does not say it did. But his mission is higher than theirs. And nevertheless, Jesus adds, the ancient order of things and the new are separated by such a gulf, that the least in the latter has a higher position than John himself. The weakest disciple has

a more spiritual intuition of divine things than the forerunner. He enjoys in Jesus the dignity of a son, while John is only a servant. The least believer is one with this Son whom John announces. It does not follow from this, that this believer is more faithful than John. John may be further advanced on his line, but none the less for that the line of the believer is higher than his. There is an element of a higher life in the one, which is wanting in the other. This reflection is added by Jesus not with a view to depreciate John, but to explain and excuse the unsteadfastness of his faith, the σκανδαλίζεσθαι (ver. 23). Several of the ancients understood by *the least* Jesus Christ, as being either John's junior, or, for the time, even less illustrious than he. The only way of supporting this interpretation would be to refer the words, *in the kingdom of God*, to *is greater*, which is evidently forced. We have given to the comparative, *less*, a superlative meaning, *least*. Meyer, pressing the idea of the comparative, gives this explanation: "he who, in the new era, has a position relatively less lofty than that which John had in the old." This meaning is far-fetched; Matt. 18 : 1 shows us how the sense of the comparative becomes superlative: he who is greater [than the other]; whence: the greatest of all. Comp. also Luke 9 : 48. This saying, the authenticity of which is beyond suspicion, shows how fully conscious Jesus was of introducing a principle of life superior to the most exalted element in Judaism.*

Vers. 29 and 30. *Retrospective Survey of the Ministry of John.*—"And all the people that heard Him, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. 30. But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves [the Pharisees and scribes rendered God's design vain in their case.—*M. Godet's Trans.*], being not baptized of him." These verses form the transition from the testimony which Jesus has just borne to John, to the application which he desires to make to the persons present. He attributes to the ministry of John a twofold result: a general movement among the lower classes of the people, ver. 29; an open opposition on the part of the rulers who determine the fate of the nation, ver. 30. Several interpreters (Knapp, Neander) have been led by the historical form of these verses to regard them as a reflection of the evangelist introduced into the discourse of Jesus. But such a mention of a fact interrupting a discourse would be unexampled. In any case it would be indicated, and the resumption of the discourse pointed out in ver. 31; the formula, *And the Lord said*, at the commencement of this verse, is not authentic. Had John been still at liberty, the words *all that heard* might, strictly speaking, have referred to a fact which had taken place at that time, to a resolution which His hearers had formed to go and be baptized by John that very hour. But John was no longer baptizing (3 : 19, 20; Matt. 11 : 2). These words are therefore the continuation of the discourse. The meaning of Jesus is: John's greatness (28*b* is only a parenthesis) was thoroughly understood by the people; for a time they did homage to his mission, while (δέ, ver. 30) the rulers rejected him. And thus it is that, notwithstanding the eagerness of the people in seeking baptism from John, his ministry has nevertheless turned out a decided failure, in regard to the nation as such, owing to the opposition of its leaders. The ob-

* It is worth considering whether the element of knowledge be not that in which the inferiority of the Baptist lies. It was from defective knowledge—even according to our author's lucid account (p. 220)—that John's question was put. Nor can it be said, surely, that John was not a son, in the same sense in which all believers are children of God.—J. H.

ject understood after *all that heard* is John the Baptist and his preaching. *To justify God* is to recognize and proclaim by word and deed the excellence of His ways for the salvation of men. The expression : *they have annulled for themselves the divine decree*, signifies that, although man cannot foil God's plan for the world, he may render it vain for himself. On this conduct of the rulers, see 3 : 7. The indirect reproof addressed by Jesus to the Pharisee Nicodemus (John 3 : 5) for having neglected the baptism of water, coincides in a remarkable manner with this passage in Luke.

In place of these two verses, we find in Matthew (11 : 12–15) a passage containing the following thoughts : The appearing of John was the close of the legal and prophetical dispensation ; and the opening of the Messianic kingdom took place immediately after. Only, men must know how to use a holy violence in order to enter into it (vers. 12, 13). John was therefore the expected Elijah : Blessed is he who understands it (vers. 14, 13) ! These last two verses occur again in Matt. 17 : 12, where they are brought in more naturally ; it is probable that some similarity in the ideas led the compiler to place them here. As to vers. 12 and 13, they are placed by Luke in a wholly different and very obscure connection, 16 : 16. According to Holtzmann, it would be Matthew who faithfully reproduces here the common source, the Logia ; while Luke, not thinking the connection satisfactory, substitutes for this passage from the Logia another taken from the proto-Mark, which Matthew introduces at 21 : 31, 32. Since, however, he was unwilling to lose the passage omitted here, he gives it another place, in a very incomprehensible context, it is true, but with a reversal of the order of the two verses, in order to make the connection more intelligible. Holtzmann quite prides himself on this explanation, and exclaims : " All the difficulties are solved. . . This example is very instructive as showing the way in which such difficulties should be treated " (pp. 143–5). The only thing proved, in our opinion, is, that by attempting to explain the origin of the Syn. by such manipulations we become lost in a labyrinth of improbabilities. Luke, forsooth, took the passage 5 : 12–15 (Matthew) away from its context, because the connection did not appear to him satisfactory, and inserted this same passage in his own Gospel, 16 : 16, in a context where it becomes more unintelligible still ! Is it not much more natural to suppose that Matthew's discourse was originally composed for a collection of Logia, in which it bore the title, " On John the Baptist," and that the compiler collected under this head all the words known to him which Jesus had uttered at different times on this subject ? As to Luke, he follows his own sources of information, which, as he has told us, faithfully represent the oral tradition, and which furnish evidence of their accuracy at every fresh test.

Gess endeavors, it is true, to prove the superiority of Matthew's text. The *violent* (Matt. 11 : 12) would be, according to him, the messengers of John the Baptist, thus designated on account of the abruptness with which they had put their question to Jesus before all the people. And Jesus declared this zeal laudable in comparison with the indifference shown by the people (vers. 31–35). But, 1. How could Jesus say of the disciples of John that they were forcing an entrance into the kingdom, while they frequently assumed a hostile attitude toward Him (Matt. 9 : 14 ; John 3 : 26) ? 2. There would be no proportion between the gravity of this saying thus understood, and that of the declarations which precede and follow it upon the end of the prophetic and the opening of the Messianic era.

Vers. 31–35.* *The Application.*—" Whereunto then shall I liken the men of this generation ? and to what are they like ? 32. They are like unto children sitting in the market-place, and calling one to another, and saying, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced ; we have mourned to you, and ye have not wept. 33. For John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine, and ye say, He hath a

* Ver. 31. The T. R. at the commencement of the verse, with some Mnn., *ειπε δε ο κυριος*. Ver. 32. Instead of *και λεγουσιν*, ℵ* B. read *α λεγει*, D. L. some Mnn. *λεγοντες*. ℵ. B. D. L. Z. omit *υμιν*. Ver. 35. Some Mjj. several Mnn. omit *παντων*. ℵ. B. some Mnn. It. place it before *των*. ℵ. reads *εργων* instead of *τεκνων*.

devil. 34. The Son of man is come eating and drinking, and ye say, Behold a gluttonous man and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners. 35. But Wisdom is justified of all her children." Here it is no longer the ministry of John simply that is the subject. Jesus is expressing His judgment of the conduct of the generation then living, with respect to the two great divine messages with which it had just been favored. There is something severe in the double question of ver. 31. Jesus has a difficulty in finding a comparison that will adequately set forth the senseless conduct which He has witnessed. At last His mind fixes on an image which answers to His thought. He recalls a game at which the children of His time were accustomed to play, and in which perhaps He had Himself in His youth taken part of an evening, in the market-place of Nazareth. This game bore some resemblance to that which we call a charade. The players divided themselves into two groups, of which each one in turn commences the representation of a scene in ordinary life, while the other, taking up the scene thus begun, finishes the representation of it. It is not therefore, as with us, the mere guessing of a word; but, in conformity with the more dramatic character of the oriental genius, a passing from the position of spectators to that of actors, so as to finish the representation commenced by the players who imagined the scene. In this case two attempts are made alternatively, one by each of the two groups of children (*προσφανοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις, calling one to another*, ver. 32); but with equal want of success. Each time the actors whose turn it is to start the game are foiled by the disagreeable humor of their companions, whose part it is to take up the representation and finish the scene. The first company comes playing a dance tune; the others, instead of rising and forming a dance, remain seated and indifferent. The latter, in their turn, indicate a scene of mourning; the others, instead of forming themselves into a funeral procession, assume a weary, sullen attitude. And thus, when the game is over, each company has reason to complain of the other, and say: "We have . . . you have not." The general meaning is obvious: the actors, in both cases, represent the two divine messengers joined by the faithful followers who gathered about them from the first: John, with his call to repentance, and his train of penitents; Jesus, with His promises of grace, and attended by a company of happy believers. But while the means they employ are so different, and so opposed even, that it seems that any man who resists the one must submit to the other, moral insensibility and a carping spirit have reached such a height in Israel that they paralyze their effects.* De Wette, Meyer, and Bleek give quite a different application of the figure. According to them, the company which begins the game represents the people, who want to make the divine messengers act according to their fancy; the other company, which refuses to enter into their humor, represents John and Jesus, who persevere, without deviation, in the path God has marked out for them. But in this case the blame in the parable should fall not on the second

* The figure, as explained by M. Godet, would rather illustrate a want of sympathy between the disciples of John and those of Jesus, than the waywardness and indifference of the Jewish people to God's messengers. Surely the difficulty which the commentators find here arises from pressing the correspondence of the figure beyond the single point of the untowardness of the generation to which John and Jesus preached.—Tr. [The translator's view of M. Godet's rendering does not appear to be well founded. He is surely right in his view of frequent indefiniteness in the introductory words—an indefiniteness belonging to the nature of the case. "That reminds me," says one, and *what he says* indicates the point of contact, the thing suggesting and the thing suggested.—J. H.]

company, which would be justified in not entering into a part imposed upon them, but on the first, which tries to exact a tyrannical compulsion on the other. Now it is not so at all. It is evident that those on whom the blame falls are the dissatisfied and peevish spectators, who each time refuse to enter into the proposed game (*and ye say . . . and ye say . . .* vers. 33, 34). Besides, when did the people seek to exert such an influence on John and Jesus as would be indicated here? Lastly, there is an evident correspondence between the two reproaches: "We have piped . . . we have mourned . . ." and the two facts: "John came . . . The Son of man is come . . ." What has led these interpreters astray is the somewhat inaccurate form in which the parable is introduced at ver. 32: "This generation is like to children calling one to another." But in these preambles the connection between the image and the idea is often indicated in a concise and somewhat inaccurate manner. Thus Matt. 8 : 24: "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a man which sowed," and elsewhere. The meaning, therefore, of ver. 32 is simply this: "The conduct of the present generation toward the messengers sent to it by God is like that which takes place among children who . . ." By the repetition of "and ye say" (vers. 33 and 34), Jesus translates, so to speak, into words, the refusal of the people to enter into the feeling of holy grief or holy joy with which God would impress them.

But notwithstanding this general resistance, divine wisdom finds some hearts which open to its different solicitations, and which justify by their docility the contrary methods it adopts. These Jesus calls *the children of wisdom*, according to an expression used in the book of Proverbs. Καί (ver. 35): "And nevertheless." The preposition ἀπό, *from*, indicates that God's justification is derived from these same men, that is to say, from their repentance on hearing the reproof and threatenings of John, and from their faith, resembling a joyous amen, in the promises of Jesus. Πάντων, *all:* not one of these children of wisdom remain behind . . . all force their way into the kingdom. The term *wisdom* recalls the word *counsel* (ver. 30); the expression *is justified*, the *justified* of ver. 29. This connection will not allow of the meaning being given to ver. 35 which some have proposed: "Divine wisdom has been justified from the accusations (ἀπό) brought against it by its own children, the Jews." This meaning is also excluded by the word *all*, which would contain an inadmissible exaggeration (ver. 29).* Instead of τέκνων, *children*, ℵ reads ἔργων, *works:* "Wisdom has derived its justification from the excellent works which it produces in those who submit to it." But the epithet πάντων, *all*, does not suit this sense. The reading ἔργων is taken from the text of Matthew, in certain documents (ℵ. B. Syr. Cop.). It would be more allowable in that Gospel, in which the word πάντων is omitted. But even then it is improbable.

This discourse is one of those which best show what Jesus was as a popular

* Holtzmann, following Hitzig, regards the word πάντων, *all*, as added by Luke, who wrongly applied (as we have done) this expression, *children of wisdom*, to believers. What wonderful sagacity our critics have! Not only do they know more than the evangelists did respecting the meaning of the words of the Master, but they have a more accurate knowledge of their exact terms! For Holtzmann's sense ὑπό would have been needed instead of ἀπό. It is unnecessary to refute the opinion of Weizsäcker and others, who regard the question of John the Baptist as the first sign of a new-born faith. This opinion gives the lie to the scene of the baptism, to the testimonies of John the Baptist, and to the answer even of Jesus (vers. 23 and 28*b*).

speaker. The understanding is brought into play, and the curiosity stimulated by the interrogative form (vers. 24, 26, and 31); and the imagination excited by lively images, full of charm (vers. 24, 25, and 32). Lastly, there is a striking application to the conscience: John failed through his austerity; I shall fail through my gentleness; neither under one form nor another will you obey God. Nevertheless there are those whose conduct by condemning you justifies God.

5. *The Gratitude of the Woman who was a Sinner:* 7:36–50.—The following narrative seems to have been placed here as an illustration of wisdom being justified by her children (ver. 35), and particularly of this last word: *all.*

Vers. 36–39.* *The Offence.* We are still in that epoch of transition, when the rupture between our Lord and the Pharisees, although already far advanced, was not complete. A member of this party could still invite Him without difficulty. It has been supposed that this invitation was given with a hostile intention. But this Pharisee's own reflection, ver. 39, shows his moral state. He was hesitating between the holy impression which Jesus made upon him, and the antipathy which his caste felt against Him. Jesus speaks to him in a tone so friendly and familiar that it is difficult to suppose him animated by malevolent feelings. Further, ver. 42 proves unanswerably that he had received some spiritual benefit from Jesus, and that he felt a certain amount of gratitude toward Him; and ver. 47 says expressly that he loved Jesus, although feebly. The entrance of the woman that was a sinner into such society was an act of great courage, for she might expect to be ignominiously sent away. The power of a gratitude that knew no bounds for a priceless benefit which she had received from the Saviour can alone explain her conduct. Ver. 42 shows what this benefit was. It was the pardon of her numerous and fearful sins. Was it on hearing Him preach, or in a private interview, or through one of those looks of Jesus, which for broken hearts were like a ray from heaven . . .? She had received from Him the joy of salvation; and the perfume which she brought with her was the emblem of her ardent gratitude for this unspeakable gift. If we adopt the Alex. reading, the sense is: "A woman who was a sinner in that city," that is to say, who practised in that very city her shameful profession. The received reading: "There was in the city a woman that was a sinner," is less harsh. Ἁμαρτωλός *a sinner*, in the same superlative sense in which the Jews thought they might apply this epithet to the Gentiles (Gal. 2:15). Μύρον denotes any kind of odoriferous vegetable essence, particularly that of the myrtle. As it was the custom when at table to recline upon a couch, the feet being directed backward, and without their sandals, there was nothing to prevent this woman from coming up to Jesus and anointing His feet. But just when she was preparing to pay Him this homage, she burst into tears at remembrance of her faults. Her tears streamed down upon the Saviour's feet, and having no cloth to wipe them, she promptly loosed her hair, and with that supplied its place. In order to duly appreciate this act, we must remember that among the Jews it was one of the greatest humiliations for a woman to be seen in public with her hair down.† The τίς ὁ for (ver. 39), refers to the name and family, and the ποταπή, *what*, to the character and conduct.

* Ver. 36. ℵ. B. D. L. Z. It$^{alliq.}$ some Mnn., τον οικον instead of την οικιαν. ℵ. B. D. L. X. Z. some Mnn., κατεκλιθη instead of ανεκλιθη. Ver. 37. ℵ. B. L. Z. It$^{alliq.}$ place ητις ην after γυνη, and not after εν τη πολει. Ver. 38. ℵ* A. D. L. X., εξεμασσεν instead of εξεμαξεν.

† See my "Commentaire sur l'Evangile de St. Jean," chap. xii. 3.

Vers. 40–43.* *The Parable.*—If this man wanted a proof of the prophetic gift of Jesus, he received it instantly in the following parable, which so exactly meets his thoughts and secret questions. The form of the following conversation is kindly, familiar, and even slightly humorous. It is just the tone of the Socratic irony. The denarius was equivalent to about three farthings; the larger of the two sums amounted, therefore, to about £16, the smaller to 32*s*. The former represents the enormous amount of sins to which this sinful woman pleaded guilty, and which Jesus had pardoned; the latter, the few infractions of the law for which the Pharisee reproached himself, and from the burden of which Jesus had also released him. Ὀρθῶς ἔκρινας: "*thou hast rightly judged;* and in judging so rightly, thou hast condemned thyself." It is the πάνυ ὀρθῶς of Socrates, when he had caught his interlocutor in his net. But that which establishes such an immeasurable distance between Jesus and the Greek sage is the way in which Jesus identifies Himself, both here and in what follows, with the offended God who pardons and who becomes the object of the sinner's grateful love.

Vers. 44–47.† *The Application.*—Jesus follows an order the inverse of that which He had taken in the parable. In the latter He descends from the cause to the effect, from the debt remitted to the gratitude experienced. In the application, on the contrary, He ascends from the effect to the cause. For the effect is evident, and comes under the observation of the senses (βλέπεις). Jesus describes it, vers. 44–46, while the cause is concealed (ver. 47), and can only be got at by means of the principle which forms the substance of the parable. During the first part of the conversation Jesus was turned toward Simon. He now turns toward the woman whom He is about to make the subject of His demonstration. Jesus had not complained of the want of respect and the impoliteness of His host. But He had noticed them, and felt them deeply. And now what a contrast He draws between the cold and measured welcome of the Pharisee, who appeared to think that it was honor enough to admit Him to his table, and the love shown by this woman that was a sinner! The customary bath for the feet had been omitted by the one, while copious tears were showered upon His feet by the other; the usual kiss with which the host received his guests Simon had neglected, while the woman had covered His feet with kisses; the precious perfume with which it was usual to anoint an honored guest on a festive day (Ps. 23 : 5) he had withheld, but she had more than made up for the omission. In fact, it is not Simon, it is she who has done Jesus the honors of the house! The omission of τῆς κεφαλῆς (ver. 44) in the Alex., "[the hairs] *of her head*," is probably the result of negligence. The word perfectly suits the context; the *head*, as the most noble part of the body, is opposed to the *feet* of Jesus. The reading εἰσῆλθεν, "[ever since] *she entered*," found in one Mn., has at first glance something taking about it. But it has too little support; and the T. R., "ever since *I entered*," is in reality preferable. Jesus thereby reminds Simon of the moment when He came under his roof, and when He had a right to expect those marks of respect and affection which had been neglected. The woman had followed Jesus so closely that she had all but entered with Him; there she was, the moment He was set at the table, to pay Him homage. From this visible effect—the total difference between the love of the

* Ver. 42. ℵ. B. L. Z. some Mnn. Syr. omit εἰπε.

† Ver. 44. της κεφαλης, which is the reading of T. R. with 11 Mjj. after θριξιν, is omitted by 11 Mjj. 25 Mnn. Syr^{sch}. It., etc. Ver. 45. L.* some Mnn. It^{aliq}. read εισηλθεν instead of εισηλθον. Ver. 47. ℵ*, ειπον instead of λεγω.

one and the love of the other, Jesus ascends, ver. 47, to its hidden cause—the difference in the measure of forgiveness accorded to them respectively. Οὗ χάριν, *wherefore;* properly, *an account of which*, that is to say, of this contrast between the respective exhibitions of your gratitude (vers. 44–46). This conjunction is the inverse of the *therefore* in ver. 42, which led from the cause to the foreseen effect. We might make this *wherefore* bear upon the principal idea, "Her sins are forgiven her." In that case we should have to regard the words λέγω σοι, *I say unto thee*, as an inserted phrase, and the last proposition as an exegetical explanation of this *wherefore:* "Wherefore I say unto thee, her many sins are forgiven, and that because she loved much." But we may also make the *wherefore* bear directly on "I say unto thee," and make all the rest of the verse the complement of this verb: "Wherefore I say unto thee, that her many sins are forgiven her, because that . . ." The latter is evidently the more simple construction. The reading, *I said unto thee*, of ℵ, would indicate that this truth was already contained in this parable. It has neither authority nor probability. How should we understand the words, *for she loved much?* Is love, according to Jesus, the cause of forgiveness? Catholic interpreters, and even many Protestants, understand the words in this sense: God forgives us much when we love much; little, if we love little. But, 1. In this case there is no coherence whatever between the parable and its application. On this principle, Jesus should not have asked, ver. 42, "Which of them *will love* Him most?" but, "Which then *loved* Him most?" The remission of the two debts of such different amounts *would result* from the different degrees of love in the two debtors; while, on the contrary, it is the difference between the debts remitted which produces the different amount of gratitude. 2. There would be, if possible, a more striking incoherence still between the first part of the application, ver. 47*a*, and the second, ver. 47*b*: "To whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little." To be logical, Jesus should have said precisely the contrary: "Who loves little, to him little is forgiven." 3. The words, *Thy faith hath saved thee* (ver. 50), clearly show what, in Jesus' view, was the principle on which forgiveness was granted to this woman; it was faith, not love. We must not forget that ὅτι, *because*, frequently expresses, just as our *for* does, not the relation of the effect to its cause, but the relation (purely logical) of the proof to the thing proved. We may say, It is light, for the sun is risen; but we may also say, The sun is risen, for [I say this because] it is light. So in this passage the ὅτι, *because, for*, may, and, according to what precedes and follows, *must* mean: "I say unto thee that her many sins are forgiven, *as thou must infer from this*, that she loved much." Thus all is consistent, the application with the parable, this saying with the words that follow, and Jesus with Himself and with St. Paul. Ver. 47*b* contains the other side of the application of this same principle: the less forgiveness, the less love. This is addressed to Simon. But with delicacy of feeling Jesus gives this severe truth the form of a general proposition, "*He to whom* . . .;" just as He also did with Nicodemus, "*Except a man* be born . . ." (John 3 : 3).

The thought expressed in this ver. 47 raises two difficulties: 1. May forgiveness be only partial? Then there would be men half-saved and half-lost! 2. Is it necessary to have sinned deeply in order to love much? The real forgiveness of the least sin certainly contains in germ a complete salvation, but only in germ. If faith is maintained and grows, this forgiveness will gradually extend to all the sins of a man's life, just as they will then become more thoroughly known and acknowledged. The first forgiveness is the pledge of all the rest. In the contrary case, the forgiveness

already granted will be withdrawn, just as represented in the parable of the wicked debtor, Matt. 18 ; and the work of grace, instead of becoming complete, will prove abortive. All is transition here below, free transition, either to perfect salvation or to complete condemnation. As to the great amount of sin necessary in order to loving much, we need add nothing to what each of us already has ; it is sufficient to estimate accurately what we have. What is wanting to the best of us, in order to love much, is not sin, but the knowledge of it.

Vers. 48-50. *Conclusion.* Bleek has inferred from ver. 48, *thy sins are forgiven thee*, that until this moment the woman had not obtained forgiveness. This supposition is excluded by all that precedes. Bleek forgets that ἀφέωνται is a perfect indicating an actual state resulting from an act accomplished at some indefinite time in the past. Having regard to the pharisaical denials of the persons composing the assembly, and to the doubts which might arise in the heart of the sinning woman herself, Jesus renews to her the assurance of the divine fact of which she had within her the witness and warrant. This direct and personal declaration corresponds with the inward witness of the Divine Spirit in our own experience, after we have embraced the promises of the Word (Eph. 1 : 13). On the objection, ver. 49, comp. ver. 21. Καί, *even ;* besides all the other extraordinary things He does. Jesus continues as if He had not heard, but all the while taking account of what was being said around Him (εἶπε δέ, "*but* He said"). While addressing the woman He shows the people assembled the firm foundation on which her forgiveness rests. She has the benefit of this decree : Whosoever believeth is saved. Let her go away, then, with her treasure, her peace, in spite of all their pharisaical murmurs ! Εἰς εἰρήνην, in peace, and to enjoy peace.

This beautiful narrative, preserved by Luke alone, contains the two essential elements of what is called Paulinism—the freeness and universality of salvation. Does it follow from this that it was invented posterior to Paul in order to set forth these great principles ? It simply proves that it was Luke's intention, as he said at the beginning (1 : 4), to show by his Gospel, that the doctrine so clearly expressed and so earnestly preached by Paul was already contained in germ in all the acts and teaching of Jesus ; that *the Gospel of Paul* is nothing but the application of the principles previously laid down by the Lord Himself.

A very similar narrative to this is found in the other three Gospels, but assigned to a much later time—to the Passion week. Mary, a sister of Lazarus, anoints Jesus at a repast which is given Him by the people of Bethany (Matt. 26 : 6, *et seq.* ; Mark 14 : 3, *et seq.* ; John 12 : 1, *et seq.*). A great number of interpreters agree that this incident is the same as that we have just been considering in Luke. They rely on the similarity of the act, on the circumstance that Luke does not relate the anointing at Bethany ; and that, on the other hand, the three other evangelists do not mention this in Galilee , and lastly, on the fact that in both cases the owner of the house where the repast is given bears the name of Simon (Luke 5 : 40 ; Matt. 26 : 6 ; Mark 14 : 3). These reasons, doubtless, have their weight ; but they are not decisive. The act of anointing was associated with such a common usage on festive occasions (Luke 5 : 46 ; Ps. 23 . 5), that there can be no difficulty in supposing that it was repeated. The causes of the omission of a narrative in one or two of the evangelists are too accidental for us to be able to base any solid conclusion upon it. We need only refer to the omission in Matthew of the healing of the possessed at Capernaum, and of the healing of the centurion's servant in Mark, omissions which it is impossible to account for. As to the name Simon, it was so common, that out of the small number of persons designated by name in the N. T., there are no less than fifteen Simons ! The reasons in favor of the difference of the two incidents are the follow-

ing: 1*st.* The difference of place—Galilee in Luke; in the other three, Judæa. This reason is of secondary value, it is true, because in chap. 10 Luke appears to place the visit of Jesus to Martha and Mary in the midst of the Galilean ministry. 2*d.* The difference of time. 3*d.* The difference of persons: the woman that was a sinner, in Luke, is a stranger in the house of the host (ver. 37, "*a woman of the city*"), and Simon himself regards her as such, and as altogether unknown to Jesus (ver. 39); Mary, on the contrary, belongs to a beloved family, which habitually received Jesus under their roof. Besides, we must always feel a repugnance to identify Mary the sister of Lazarus, as we know her in John 11 and Luke 10 : 38–42, with a woman of ill fame. 4*th.* The most important difference respects what was said: at Bethany, a complaint from Judas on behalf of the poor, and a reply from Jesus announcing His approaching death; in Galilee, the great evangelical declaration, that love is the fruit of forgiveness, which is bestowed on the simple condition of faith. What agreement can be discovered between these two conversations? We may conceive of very considerable alterations being made by tradition in the historical framework of a narrative. But by what marvellous process could one of these two conversations have been transformed into the other?

6. *The Women who ministered to Jesus:* 8 : 1–3.—By the side of the high religious problems raised by the life of Jesus, there is a question, seldom considered, which nevertheless possesses some interest: How did Jesus find the means of subsistence during the two or three years that His ministry lasted? He had given up His earthly occupation. He deliberately refrained from using His miraculous power to supply His necessities. Further, He was not alone; He was constantly accompanied by twelve men, who had also abandoned their trade, and whose maintenance He had taken on Himself in calling them to follow Him. The wants of this itinerant society were met out of a common purse (John 13 : 29); the same source furnished their alms to the poor (John 12 : 6). But how was this purse itself filled? The problem is partly, but not completely, explained by hospitality. Had He not various needs, of clothing, etc.? The true answer to this question is furnished by this passage, which possesses, therefore, considerable interest. Jesus said: "Seek first the kingdom of God, and other things shall be added unto you." He also said: "There is none that leaves father, mother, . . . house, lands for the kingdom of God, who does not find a hundred times more." He derived these precepts from His daily experience. The grateful love of those whom He filled with His spiritual riches provided for His temporal necessities, as well as for those of His disciples. Some pious women spontaneously rendered Him the services of mother and sisters.

This passage would suffice to prove the excellence of Luke's sources; their originality, for the other evangelists furnish no similar information; their exactness, for who would have invented such simple and positive details, with the names and rank of these women? and their purity, for what can be further removed from false marvels and legendary fictions than this perfectly natural and prosaic account of the Lord's means of subsistence during the course of His ministry?

Vers. 1–3.* Luke indicates this time as a distinctly marked epoch in the ministry of the Lord. He ceases to make Capernaum, His *ἰδία πόλις*, *His own city* (Matt. 9 : 1), the centre of His activity; He adopts an altogether itinerant mode of life, and literally has no place where to lay His head. It is this change in His mode of living, carried out at this time, which induces Luke to place here this glimpse into the means

* Ver. 3. Instead of *αυτω*, which is the reading of T. R. with ℵ. A. L. M. X. Π. several Mnn. It$^{\text{aliq.}}$, *αυτοις* is read in 13 Mjj. 90 Mnn. Syr. It$^{\text{aliq.}}$ Or. Aug. The MSS. vary between *εκ* and *απο*.

of His material support. The aor. *ἐγένετο, it came to pass* (ver. 1), indicates a definite time. The *καί* before *αὐτός*, as the sign of the apodosis, betrays an Aramæan source. The imperf. *διώδευε, He went throughout*, denotes a slow and continuous mode of travelling. The preposition *κατά* expresses the particular care which He bestowed on every place, whether large (*city*) or small (*village*). Everywhere He gave Himself time to stay. To the general idea of a proclamation, expressed by the verb *κηρύσσειν, to preach*, the second verb, *to evangelize*, to announce the glad tidings of the kingdom, adds the idea of a proclamation of *grace* as the prevailing character of His teaching. The Twelve accompanied Him. What a strange sight this little band presented, passing through the cities and country as a number of members of the heavenly kingdom, entirely given up to the work of spreading and celebrating salvation! Had the world ever seen anything like it? Among the women who accompanied this band, filling the humble office of servants, Luke makes special mention first of *Mary*, surnamed *Magdalene*. This surname is probably derived from her being originally from Magdala, a town situated on the western shore of the sea of Galilee (Matt. 15 : 39), the situation of which to the north of Tiberias is still indicated at the present day by a village named *El-Megdil* (*the tower*). The seven demons (Mark 16 : 9) denote without doubt the culminating point of her possession, resulting from a series of attacks, each of which had aggravated the evil (Luke 11 : 24–26). It is without the least foundation that tradition identifies Mary Magdalene with the penitent sinner of chap. 7. Possession, which is a disease (see 4 : 33), has been wrongly confounded with a state of moral corruption. The surname, *of Magdala*, is intended to distinguish this Mary from all the others of this name, more particularly from her of Bethany. *Chuza* was probably intrusted with some office in the household of Herod Antipas. Might he not be that *βασιλικός, court lord*, whose son Jesus had healed (John 4), and who had believed *with all his house?* We know nothing of Susanna and the other women. *Αἵτινες* reminds us that it was in the capacity of servants that they accompanied Him. *Διακονεῖν, to serve*, here denotes pecuniary assistance, as Rom. 15 : 25, and also the personal attentions which might be rendered by a mother or sisters (ver. 21). The reading of the T. R., *αὐτῷ*, who served *Him*, may be a correction in accordance with Matt. 27 : 55, Mark 15 : 41 ; but the reading *αὐτοῖς*, who served *them*, is the more probable one according to ver. 1 (the Twelve) and 4 : 39.

What a Messiah for the eye of flesh, this being living on the charity of men! But what a Messiah for the spiritual eye, this Son of God living on the love of those to whom His own love is giving life! What an interchange of good offices between heaven and earth goes on around His person!

7 *The Parable of the Sower* : 8 : 4–18.—The preceding passage indicated a change in the mode of the Lord's outward life. The following passage indicates a change in His mode of teaching ; a crisis, therefore, has been reached. The sequel will make us acquainted with its nature. Before this, Jesus had spoken a few parables (5 : 36–39, 6 : 39, 47, *et seq.*). From now, and for a very long time, He habitually makes use of this method. The parable possesses the double property of making an indelible impression of the truth on the mind of him who is able to perceive it through the figure in which it is clothed, and of veiling it from the observation of the inattentive or indolent hearer whose mind makes no effort to penetrate this covering. It is thus admirably fitted for making a selection from the hearers. The term *parable* (from *παραβάλλειν, to place side by side*) denotes a form of instruction in which, by the side of the truth, is placed the image which represents it. This is also the meaning of

παροιμία, a path by the side of the high road. The parable bears a close resemblance to the fable: but it differs from it in two respects, one of substance, the other of form. While the fable refers to the relations of men with one another, and to the moral laws which regulate these relations, the parable deals with man's relations with God, and with the lofty principles by which they are governed. The loftier sphere in which the parable moves determines the difference of form which distinguishes it from the fable The fable partakes of a humorous character; it is quite allowable, therefore, in it to make plants and animals speak. The aim of the parable is too serious to comport with such fictions. There must be nothing in the picture to violate probability. Animals and material objects may be employed in the parable (sheep, leaven); but they must not assume a character contrary to their actual nature. The parable was the most natural mode of teaching for Jesus to adopt. Living in the incessant contemplation of the divine world, which lay open to His inward sense, finding Himself at the same time also in constant intercourse with the external world, which He observed with intelligent and calm attention, He was necessarily led to make constant comparisons of these two spheres, and to perceive the innumerable analogies which exist between them.

The first parable He uttered that was fully worked out, appears to have been this of the sower. Matthew makes it the opening parable of the large collection in chap. 13. Mark assigns it a similar place at the head of a more limited collection, chap. 4. It is the only one besides that of the vine-dressers, a parable belonging to our Lord's last days, which has been preserved in all the three Syn. In all three, the general explanation, which Jesus gives His disciples once for all, as to why He employs this form of teaching, is connected with the account of this parable. It appears, therefore, that it was the first complete similitude that He offered them. Moreover, it was the one which seems to have struck the disciples the most, and which was most frequently told in the oral tradition; this explains its reproduction by our three evangelists.

The following passage contains: 1*st*. The parable (vers. 4–8); 2*d*. The explanations given by Jesus respecting this mode of teaching (vers. 9 and 10); 3*d*. The exposition of the parable (vers. 11–15); 4*th*. A warning to the apostles as to the course they must pursue in regard to truths which Jesus teaches them in this way (vers. 16–18).

1*st*. Vers. 4–8.* *The Parable.*—Matthew and Mark place this parable after the visit of the mother and brethren of Jesus (Matt. 13 : 1; Mark 4 : 1). In Luke it immediately precedes the same narrative (ver. 19, *et seq.*). This connection may be the result of a real chronological relation, or of a moral relation as well; comp. ver. 15, "those who keep the word and bring forth fruit," with ver. 21, "those who hear the word of God and practise it." We might make τῶν ἐπιπορευομένων, *coming together unto Him*, the complement of ὄχλου, *a multitude*, by giving καί the sense of *even*. But this construction is forced the two genitives, are parallel. Luke's meaning is: "As a great multitude was gathered about Him, and as it was continually increasing, owing to fresh additions, which were arriving more or less from every city." This prefatory remark contains a great deal. Jesus goes through the country stopping at every place; the Twelve are His immediate attendants; the cities are

* Ver. 4. ℵ. some Mnn., συνοντος. Ver. 6. B. L. R. Z., κατεπεσεν instead of επεσεν. Ver. 8. Almost all the Mjj. read εις instead of επι, which is the reading of T. R. with D. and some Mnn.

emptied, so to speak ; their entire populations accompany Him. We have evidently reached a crisis. But the more the number of His hearers increases, the more clearly Jesus sees that the time has come to set some sifting process to work among them ; if, on the one hand, it is necessary to draw the spiritual into closer attachment, on the other, it is of importance to keep the carnal at a distance. The parables, in general, have this tendency ; that of the sower, by its very meaning, has a direct application to this state of things. It appears from Matthew and Mark that Jesus was seated in a vessel on the sea-shore, and that from this kind of pulpit He taught the people who stood upon the banks. He could therefore easily discern the various expressions of the persons composing the multitude. The art. ὁ before σπείρων designates that one of the servants who has been intrusted with this work. Gess points out the contrast between this sower, who commences the work of establishing the kingdom of God by means of the Word alone, and the Messiah, as pictured by John the Baptist, *having His fan in His hand*. Jesus divides His hearers into four classes, and compares them to four kinds of soil, of which the surrounding country furnished Him with illustrations at the very time He was speaking. From the edge of the lake the soil rises very rapidly ; now, on such slopes, it easily happens that the higher portion of a field has only a thin layer of mould, while, going down toward the plain, the bed of earth becomes deeper. Hence the differences indicated. The first soil (*by the wayside*) is the part nearest the path which is freely used by passers-by. The second (*on the rock*, according to Luke ; *in stony places*, in Matthew and Mark) does not denote, as is often thought, a soil full of stones ; but, as is well expressed by Luke, and confirmed by the explanation, *because there was no depth of earth* (Matthew and Mark), that portion of the field where the rock is only covered with a thin layer of earth. The third is a fertile soil, but already choke-full of the seeds of thorns and briers. There remains the *good soil* (Mark and Matthew, καλή). This last land is neither *hard* as the first, nor *thin* as the second, nor *unclean* as the third ; it is soft, deep, and free from other seeds. The four prep. employed by Luke well describe these different relations of the seed with the soil : παρά, *by the side ;* ἐπί, *upon ;* ἐν μέσῳ, *in the midst ;* εἰς, *into* (ἐπί in the T. R., ver. 8, has only very insufficient authorities).

The fate of the seed is determined by the nature of the soil. On the first soil it does not even spring up. The φυέν, *having sprung up* (vers. 6–8), is passed over in silence in the 5th verse. Not having germinated, the seed is destroyed by external causes, the passers-by and the birds. Matthew and Mark mention only the latter. On the second soil the seed springs up ; but the root, immediately meeting with the rock, cannot develop itself in proportion to the stem, and, as soon as the sun has dried up the thin layer of earth, the plant perishes. The seed on the third soil grows into ear ; but briers choke it before the grain is formed. Thus in the first case there are two external causes of destruction ; in the second, an external and an internal cause ; in the third, a single cause, and this altogether internal. On the fourth soil the plant successfully accomplishes the entire cycle of vegetation. Luke only mentions the highest degree of fertility, a hundred-fold. Matthew and Mark speak of lesser degrees ; Mark in an ascending, and Matthew in a descending order. How puerile and unworthy of earnest men these trifling variations would be, if the evangelists worked upon a common document !

The Lord invites the serious attention of the multitude to this result ; ἐφώνει, *He raises His voice* [*He cried*, A.V.], these are the words which He emphasizes. He

endeavors to awaken that inward sense for divine things, without which religious teaching is only an empty sound. The design of Jesus is, first of all, to show that He is not deceived by the sight of this crowd, which is apparently so attentive; then to put His disciples on their guard against the expectations which such a large concourse might create in their minds: lastly, and more than all, to warn His hearers of the perils which threatened the holy impressions they were then experiencing.

2*d*. Vers. 9 and 10.* *The Parables in general.*—"And His disciples asked Him, saying, What might this parable be? 10. And He said, Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God: but to others in parables; that seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not understand." The question of the disciples referred solely to the meaning of the preceding parable; but Jesus takes advantage of it to give them a general explanation of this mode of teaching. It is the same in Mark, who only adds this detail: *when they were alone with Him.* In Matthew the question of the disciples is altogether general: "Wherefore speakest Thou unto them in parables?" This form of the question appears to us less natural. The reply of Jesus is more extended in Matthew. He quotes *in extenso* the prophecy of Isaiah (chap. 6) to which Luke's text alludes, and which Mark incorporates into the discourse of Jesus. Bleek professes to find in the *because* of Matthew (13: 13) a less harsh thought than the *in order that* of Mark and Luke. He is wrong; the thought is absolutely the same. In both cases, Jesus distinctly declares that the object of His parables is not to make divine truths intelligible to all, but to veil them from those who are indifferent to them. And it is for this very reason that He avails Himself of this mode of teaching just from this time. By such preaching as the Sermon on the Mount He had accomplished the first work of His spiritual fishing; He had cast the net. Now begins the second, the work of selection; and this He accomplishes by means of teaching in parables. As we have seen, the parable possesses the double property of attracting some, while it repels others. The veil which it throws over the truth becomes transparent to the attentive mind, while it remains impenetrable to the careless. The opposition between these two results is expressed in Luke by these words designedly placed at the beginning of the phrase, *to you* and *to others.* It is the same in Matthew, *to you* and *to those;* in Mark, more forcibly still, *to you* and *to those who are without.* The perf. δέδοται does not refer to any antecedent decree (the aor. would have been required), but to the actual condition of the disciples, which renders them fit to receive the revelation of divine things. It is the inward drawing due to divine teaching, of which Jesus speaks in John 6. The term *mystery*, in Scripture, denotes the plan of salvation, in so far as it can only be known by man through a higher revelation (μύω, *to initiate*). Used in the plural (*the mysteries*), it denotes the different parts of this great whole. These are the heavenly things of which Jesus spoke to Nicodemus (John 3: 12), and which He contrasted with the *earthly things* which He had preached at the commencement. The verb understood before ἐν παραβολαῖς is λαλεῖται. But how, when God makes a revelation, can it be His will not to be understood, as Isaiah says (chap. 6), and as is repeated here by Jesus? That is not, as Riggenbach says, either His first will or His last. It is an intermediate decree; it is a chastisement. When the heart has failed to open to the first beams of truth, the brighter beams which follow, instead of enlightening, dazzle

* Ver. 9. ℵ. B. D. L. R. Z. some Mnn. Syr. Itplerique, omit λεγοντες before τις. Ver. 10. ℵ. R. some Mnn., ακουσωσιν instead of συνιωσιν.

and blind it ; and this result is willed by God ; it is a judgment. Since Pharaoh refuses to humble himself under the first lessons he receives, subsequent lessons shall harden him ; for, if he is unwilling to be converted himself, he must at least subserve the conversion of others by the conspicuousness of his punishment. The Jewish people themselves, in the time of Isaiah, were just in this position. God makes them feel this by calling them, not *my people*, but *this people*. God already sees that the nation is incapable of fulfilling the part of an apostle to the world which had departed from Him. This part it shall accomplish, nevertheless ; only it shall not be by its missionary action, but by its ruin. This ruin, therefore, becomes necessary ; and *because* this ruin is necessary (Matthew), or *in order that* it may take place (Mark and Luke), Israel must be hardened. A similar state of things recurred at the period in Jesus' ministry which we have now reached. Israel rejected as a nation the light which shone in Jesus ; and this light covered itself under the veil of the parable. But through this veil it sent out still more brilliant rays into the hearts of those who, like His disciples, had welcomed with eagerness its first beams. The terms, *see, hear*, refer to the description in the parable ; *not seeing*, and *not understanding*, to its real meaning.

3*d*. Vers. 11-15.* *The Explanation of the Parable.*—The expression, *Now the parable is this* (ver. 11), signifies that the essence of the picture is not in its outward form, but in its idea. The point of resemblance between the word and the seed is the living power contained in a vehicle which conceals it. By *the word* Jesus doubtless means primarily His own teaching, but He also comprehends in it any preaching that faithfully represents His own. Among the multitude Jesus discerned four kinds of expression : countenances expressing thoughtlessness and indifference ; faces full of enthusiasm and delight ; others with a care-worn, preoccupied expression ; and lastly, expressions of serene joy, indicating a full acceptance of the truth that was being taught. In the explanation which follows, the word is sometimes identified with the new life which is to spring from it, and the latter with the individuals themselves, in whom it is found. This accounts for the strange expressions : *those which are sown by the wayside* (ver. 12 ; comp. vers. 13, 14, 15) ; *these have no root* (ver. 13) ; *they are choked* (ver. 14). The first class contains those who are wholly insensible to religion, who are conscious of no need, have no fear of condemnation, no desire of salvation, and consequently no affinity with the gospel of Christ. In their case, therefore, the word becomes a prey to external agents of destruction. Only one is mentioned in the application, *the devil* (Luke), *Satan* (Mark), *the evil one* (Matthew), who employs various means of diverting their minds, in order to make them forget what they have heard. Had not Jesus believed in the existence of Satan, He would never have spoken of him as a reality answering to the figure of the parable. Οἱ ἀκούοντες, *who hear*, must be thus explained : " who hear, and *nothing more*." This implies Matthew's *do not understand*.

The second are the superficial but excitable natures, in whom imagination and sensibility for the moment make up for the absence of moral feeling. They are charmed with the novelty of the Gospel, and the opposition which it offers to received ideas. In every awakening, such men form a considerable portion of the new converts. But in their case the word soon comes into conflict with an internal hin-

* Ver. 12. ℵ. B. L. U. Z. some Mnn., ακουσαντες instead of ακουοντες. Ver. 13. ℵ* D. F^w. X., την πετραν instead of της πετρας.

drance : a heart of stone which the humiliation of repentance and the love of holiness have never broken. Thus it finds itself given over to external agents of destruction, such as *temptation* (Luke), *tribulation*, and *persecution* (Matthew and Mark) ; the enmity of the rulers, the rage of the Pharisees, the danger of excommunication, in a word, the necessity of suffering in order to remain faithful. Those who have merely sought for spiritual enjoyment in the Gospel are therefore overcome. In ver. 13 the verb *εἰσίν* must be understood, and *οἱ ὅταν* must be made the predicate : *are those who, when . . .* The *οἱ* at the end of the verse is a development of *οὗτοι*, and signifies *who, as such.*

The third are persons with a measure of earnestness, but their heart is divided ; they seek salvation and acknowledge the value of the gospel, but they are bent also upon their earthly welfare, and are not determined to sacrifice everything for the truth. These persons are often found at the present day among those who are regarded as real Christians. Their worldly-mindedness maintains its ground notwithstanding their serious interest in the gospel, and to the end hinders their complete conversion. The miscarriage of the seed here results from an inward cause, which is both one and threefold : cares (in the case of those who are in poverty), riches (in those who are making their fortune), and the pleasures of life (in those who are already rich). These persons, like Ananias and Sapphira, have overcome the fear of persecution, but, like them, they succumb to the inward obstacle of a divided heart. Πορευόμενοι, *go forth*, describes the bustle of an active life, coming and going in the transaction of business (2 Sam. 3 : 1). It is in this verse especially that the seed is identified with the new life in the believer. The form differs completely in the three Syn.

In the fourth their spiritual wants rule their life. Their conscience is not asleep, as in the first ; it is that, and not, as in the case of the second, imagination or sensibility, which rules the will ; it prevails over the earthly interests which have sway in the third. These are the souls described by Paul in Rom. 7. Ἐν *καρδίᾳ* and *τὸν λόγον* depend on the two verbs *ἀκούσαντες κατέχουσιν* combined, which together denote one and the same act : *to hear* and *to keep*, for such persons, are the same thing. The term *perseverance* refers to the numerous obstacles which the seed has had to overcome in order to its full development ; comp. the *καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ* (Rom. 2 : 7). Jesus was certainly thinking here of the disciples, and of the devoted women who accompanied Him. Luke makes no mention either in the parable or the explanation of the different degrees of fertility indicated by Matthew and Mark, and the latter mention them here also in a contrary order.

We do not think that a single verse of this explanation of the parable is compatible with the hypothesis of the employment of a common text by the evangelists, or of their having copied from each other ; at least it must be admitted that they allowed themselves to trifle, in a puerile and profane way, with the words of the Lord. The constant diversity of the three texts is, on the other hand, very naturally explained, if their original source was the traditional teaching.

4th. Vers. 16–18.* *Practical Conclusion.*—" No man, when he hath lighted a candle, covereth it with a vessel, or putteth it under a bed ; but setteth it on a candlestick, that they which enter in may see the light. 17. For nothing is secret that shall

* Ver. 16. The MSS. vary between *επι λυχνιας* and *επι την λυχνιαν* (a reading derived from Matthew and Mark, and from 11 : 33). Ver. 17. ℵ. B. L. Z., *ο ου μη γνωσθη* instead of *ο ου γνωσθησεται.*

not be made manifest; neither anything hid that shall not be known and come abroad. 18. Take heed therefore how ye hear; for whosoever hath, to him shall be given; and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he seemeth to have." Bleek can perceive no connection between these reflections and the preceding parable. But they are closely connected with the similar reflections in vers. 9 and 10. There is even a designed antithesis between the growth of the light (ver. 16 and 17) and the increase of the darkness (ver. 10). Jesus is speaking to the disciples. The word which is translated *candle* denotes simply a lamp, just a saucer filled with oil in which a wick is placed—the mode of lighting most used in the East. It may therefore be placed without any danger under such a vessel as a bushel, which serves at once for measure, table, and dish among the poor, or under the divan (κλίνη), a bench furnished with cushions and raised from the floor from one to three feet, on which it is customary to rest while engaged in conversation or at meals. Beds properly so called are not used in the East; they generally lie on the ground, on wraps and carpets.* The lighted lamp might denote the apostles, whom Jesus enlightens with a view to make them the teachers of the world. *Covering their light* would be not putting them into a position of sufficient influence in regard to other men: and *setting it on a candlestick* would signify, conferring on them the apostolic office, in virtue of which they will become the light of the world. Those who see the light on entering the house would be their converts from the Jews and heathen. Ver. 17 would be an allusion, as in 12 : 3, to that law according to which truth is to be fully revealed to the world by the apostolic preaching. Lastly, the 18th verse would refer to that growth of inward light which is the recompense of the preacher for the faithfulness of his labors. But it is just this last verse which upsets the whole of this interpretation. For, 1. With this meaning, Jesus ought to have said, not: *Take heed how ye hear*, but, *how ye preach*. 2. *To have*, in the sense of the 18th verse, is not certainly to produce fruits in others, but to possess the truth one's self. We must therefore regard the term λύχνος, *the lamp*, as denoting the truth concerning the kingdom of God which Jesus unveils to the apostles in His parables. If He clothes the truth in sensible images, it is not to render it unintelligible (*to put it under a bushel*); on the contrary, in explaining it to them, as He has just done, He places it on the candlestick; and they are the persons who are illuminated on entering into the house. All will gradually become clear to them. While the night thickens over Israel on account of its unbelief, the disciples will advance into even fuller light, until there is nothing left in the plan of God (*His mysteries*, ver. 11) which *is obscure or hidden* (ver 17). The heart of Jesus is lifted up at this prospect. This accounts for the poetical rhythm which always appears at such moments. Here we see why it behoves the disciples to hear with the greatest care; it is in order that they may really hold what He gives them, like the good soil which receives and fertilizes the seed (ver. 18). He alone who assimilates His teaching by an act of living comprehension, who really hath (the opposite of seeing without seeing, ver. 10), can receive continually more. Acquisitions are made only by means of, and in proportion to, what is already possessed. The Spirit Himself only makes clear what has been kept (John 14 : 26). If, therefore, any one among them contents Himself with hearing truth without appropriating it, by and by he will obtain nothing, and at last even lose everything.

* Félix Boret, "Voyage en Terre-Sainte," pp. 348 and 349.

Mark (4 : 21–25) says : *that which he hath ;* Luke : *that which he thinketh he hath.* It comes to the same thing ; for, as to what is heard without comprehending it, it is equally true to say that he hath (in a purely external sense), or that he thinks he hath (in the real sense of the word *have*). Comp. Luke 19 : 26. This very apophthegm is found several times in Matthew. It expresses one of the profoundest laws of the moral world. Baur and Hilgenfeld thought they found in the word δοκεῖ, *thinks* he hath, a censure of Luke on the haughty pretensions of the Twelve ! Our evangelists could never have anticipated that they would ever have such perverse interpreters. Nothing could more effectually allay any undue elation which the sight of these multitudes might excite in the minds of the disciples, than their being reminded in this way of their responsibility. The similar reflections in Mark (4 : 25) are too different in form to have been drawn from the same source.

Mark goes on to narrate the parable of the ear of corn, which he alone records. In Matthew there are six parables respecting the kingdom of God given along with that of the sower. They form an admirable whole. After the foundation of the kingdom described in the parable of the sower, there follows the mode of its development in that of the tares ; then its power, presented under two aspects (extension and transformation)—in those of the grain of mustard seed and the leaven ; next, its incomparable value in the parables of the treasure and the pearl ; lastly, its consummation in that of the net. Is this systematic plan to be attributed to Jesus ? I think not. He was too good a teacher to relate in this way seven parables all in a breath.* On the other hand, did He only utter on this occasion the parable of the sower ? Certainly not, for Matthew says respecting this very time (13 : 3) : "And He spake many things unto them in parables," and Mark (4 : 2) : "He taught them many things in parables." Probably, therefore, Jesus spoke on this day, besides the parable of the sower, that of the tares (Matthew), and that of the ear of corn (Mark), the images of which are all taken from the same sphere, and which immediately follow the first, the one in one Gospel, the other in the other. As to the other parables, Matthew has united them with the preceding, in accordance with his constant method of grouping the sayings of our Lord around a given subject. Such different arrangements do not appear compatible with the use of the same written document.

8. *Visit of the Mother and Brethren of Jesus :* 8 : 19–21.—We should have been ignorant of the real object of this visit, unless, in this as in several other cases, Mark's narrative had come in to supplement that of the other two. According to Mark, a report had reached the brethren of Jesus that He was in a state of excitement bordering on madness ; it was just the echo of this accusation of the Pharisees : "He casteth out devils by Beelzebub." Comp. Mark 3 : 21, 22. His brethren therefore came, intending to *lay hold on Him* (κρατῆσαι αὐτόν, ver. 21), and take Him home. Matthew also connects this visit (12 : 46) with the same accusation. In John, the brethren of Jesus are represented in a similar attitude in regard to Him (7 : 5) : "His brethren also did not believe on Him." As to Mary, it is not said that she shared the sentiments of her sons. But when she saw them set out under the influence of such feelings, she would naturally desire to be present at the painful scene which she anticipated would take place. Perhaps also, like John the Baptist, she was unable to explain to herself the course which her Son's work was taking, and was distracted between contrary impressions.

* I abide by this statement, notwithstanding the contrary assertion of Gess.

Vers. 19–21.* The word *without* (ver. 20) might be understood to mean: "outside the circle which surrounded Jesus." But Mark expressly mentions a house in which he was receiving hospitality (ver. 20), and where a large crowd *was seated around Him* (vers. 32 and 34): Are these brethren of Jesus younger sons of Joseph and Mary, or sons of Joseph by a previous marriage; or are they cousins of Jesus, sons of Cleopas (the brother of Joseph), who would be called his brethren, as having been brought up in the house of their uncle Joseph? We cannot discuss this question here. (See our "Commentary on the Gospel of John," ii. 12). One thing is certain, that the literal interpretation of the word *brother*, placed, as it is here, by the side of the word *mother*, is the most natural. The answer of Jesus signifies, not that family ties are in His eyes of no value (comp. John 19 : 26), but that they are subordinate to a tie of a higher and more durable nature. In those women who accompanied Him, exercising over Him a mother's care (vers. 2 and 3), and in those disciples who so faithfully associated themselves with Him in His work, He had found a family which supplied the place of that which had deliberately forsaken Him. And this new spiritual relationship, eternal even as the God in whom it was based, was it not superior in dignity to a relationship of blood, which the least accident might break? In this saying He expresses a tender and grateful affection for those faithful souls whose love every day supplied the place of the dearest domestic affection. He makes no mention of father; this place belongs in His eyes to God alone. We see how the description of the actual circumstances, given by Mark, enables us to understand the appropriateness of this saying. This fact proves that Luke knew neither the narrative of this evangelist, nor that of the alleged proto-Mark. How could he in sheer wilfulness have neglected the light which such a narrative threw upon the whole scene?

9. *The Stilling of the Storm:* 8 : 22–25.—We come now to a series of narratives which are found united together in the three Syn. (Matt. 8 : 18 *et seq.*; Mark 4 : 35 *et seq.*): the storm, the demoniac, the daughter of Jairus, together with the woman afflicted with an issue of blood. From the connection of these incidents in our three Gospels, it has frequently been inferred that their authors made use of a common written source. But, 1. How, in this case, has it come to pass that this cycle fills quite a different place in Matthew (immediately after the Sermon on the Mount) from that which it occupies in the other two? And 2. How came Matthew to intercalate, between the return of Jesus and the account of the daughter of Jairus, two incidents of the greatest importance—the healing of the paralytic (9 : 1 *et seq.*), and the call of Matthew—with the feast and the discourse which follow it (ver. 9 *et seq.*), incidents which in Mark and Luke occupy quite a different place? The use of a written source does not accord with such independent arrangement. It is a very simple explanation to maintain that, in the traditional teaching, it was customary to relate these three facts together, probably for the simple reason that they were chronologically connected, and that to this natural cycle there were sometimes added, as in Matthew, other incidents which did not belong historically to this precise time. That which renders this portion particularly remarkable is, that in it we behold the miraculous power of Jesus at its full height: power over the forces of nature (the storm); over the powers of darkness (the demoniacs); lastly, over death (the daughter of Jairus).

* Ver. 20. ℵ. B. D. L. Δ. Z. some Mnn. Syr. It. omit λεγοντων. Ver. 21. The Alex. omit αυτον.

Vers. 22–25.* Miracles of this kind, while manifesting the original power of man over nature, are at the same time the prelude of the regeneration of the visible world which is to crown the moral renovation of humanity (Rom. 8). From Matthew's narrative it might be inferred that this voyage took place on the evening of the same day on which the Sermon on the Mount was spoken. But, on the other hand, too many things took place, according to Matthew himself, for the limits of a single day. Mark places this embarkation on the evening of the day on which Jesus spoke the parable of the sower; this note of the time is much more probable. Luke's indication of the time is more general: *on one of these days*, but it does not invalidate Mark's. The object of this excursion was to preach the gospel in the country situated on the other side of the sea, in accordance with the plan drawn out in 8 : 1. According to Mark, the disciples' vessel was accompanied by other boats. When they started, the weather was calm, and Jesus, yielding to fatigue, fell asleep. The pencil of Mark has preserved this never-to-be-forgotten picture: the Lord reclining on the hinder part of the ship, with His head upon a pillow that had been placed there by some friendly hand. It often happens on lakes surrounded by mountains, that sudden and violent storms of wind descend from the neighboring heights, especially toward evening, after a warm day. This well-known phenomenon is described by the word *κατέβη, came down.*† In the expression *συνεπληροῦντο, they were filled*, there is a confusion of the vessel with those whom it carries. The term *ἐπιστάτα* is peculiar to Luke; Mark says *διδάσκαλε*, Matthew *κύριε*. How ridiculous these variations would be if all three made use of the same document! The 24th verse describes one of the sublimest scenes the earth has ever beheld: man, calmly confident in God, by the perfect union of his will with that of the Almighty, controlling the wild fury of the blind forces of nature. The term *ἐπετίμησε, rebuked*, is an allusion to the hostile character of this power in its present manifestation. Jesus speaks not only to the wind, but to the water; for the agitation of the waves (*κλύδων*) continues after the hurricane is appeased.

In Mark and Luke, Jesus first of all delivers His disciples from danger, then He speaks to their heart. In Matthew, he first upbraids them, and then stills the storm. This latter course appears less in accordance with the wisdom of the Lord. But why did the apostles deserve blame for their want of faith? Ought they to have allowed the tempest to follow its course, in the assurance that with Jesus with them they ran no danger, or that in any case He would awake in time? Or did Jesus expect that one of them, by an act of prayer and commanding faith, would still the tempest? It is more natural to suppose that what He blames in them is the state of trouble and agitation in which He finds them on awaking. When faith possesses the heart, its prayer may be passionate and urgent, but it will not be full of trouble. There is nothing surprising, whatever any one may say, in the exclamation attributed to those who witnessed this scene (ver. 25): first, because there were other persons there besides the apostles (Mark 4 : 36); next, because such incidents, even when similar

* Ver. 24. ℵ[a] X. Γ. several Mnn. Syr[cur]. It[plerique], omit *επιστατα επιστατα*. D. reads *κυριε κυριε*. ℵ. E. F. G. H. some Mnn. It[alii]., *επαυσατο* instead of *επαυσαντο*. K. Δ. Π. several Mnn. add *μεγαλη* to *γαληνη* (taken from the parallel passages).

† On these hurricanes, to which the Lake of Gennesareth is particularly exposed, comp. W. Thompson, "The Land and the Book," London, 1868, p. 375 (cited by M. Furrer): "Storms of wind rush wildly through the deep mountain gorges which descend from the north and north-east, and are not only violent, but sudden; they often take place when the weather is perfectly clear."

occurrences have been seen before, always appear new ; lastly, because this was the first time that the apostles saw their Master contend with the blind forces of nature.

Strauss maintains that this is a pure myth. Keim, in opposition to him, alleges the evident antiquity of the narrative (the sublime majesty of the picture of Jesus, the absence of all ostentation from His words and actions, and the simple expression of wonder on the part of the spectators). The narrative, therefore, must have some foundation in fact, in some natural incident of water-travel, which has been idealized in accordance with such words as Ps. 107 : 23, *et seq.*, and the appeal to Jonah (1 : 4–6) : "Awake, O sleeper." There, says criticism, you see how this history was made We should rather say, how the trick was done.

10. *The Healing of the Demoniac :* 8 : 26–39.—This portion brings before us a storm no less difficult to still, and a yet more striking victory. Luke and Mark mention only one demoniac ; Matthew speaks of two. The hypothesis of a common written source here encounters a difficulty which is very hard for it to surmount. But criticism has expedients to meet all cases : according to Holtzmann, Matthew, who had omitted the healing of the demoniac at Capernaum, here repairs this omission, "by grouping the possessed who had been neglected along with this new case" (p. 255). This is a sample of what is called at the present day critical sagacity. As if the evangelists had no faith themselves in what they wrote with a view to win the faith of others ! Why should it be deemed impossible for the two maniacs to have lived together, and for the healing of only one of the two to have presented the striking features mentioned in the following narrative ? However it was, we have here a proof of the independence of Matthew's narratives on the one hand, and of those of Mark and Luke on the other.

Vers. 26–29.* *The Encounter.*—There are three readings of the name of the inhabitants, and unfortunately they are also found in both the other Syn. Epiphanius mentions the following forms : Γεργεσηνῶν in Mark and Luke (but in it is probable that, in the case of Luke, we should read Γερασηνῶν in this Father) ; Γαδαρηνῶν in Matthew (Γεργεσαίων in some manuscripts). It would seem to follow from a passage in Origen ("Ad. Joh." t. vi. c. 24) that the most widely-diffused reading in his time was Γερασηνῶν, that Γαδαρηνῶν was only read in a small number of manuscripts, and that Γεργεσηνῶν was only a conjecture of his own. He states that *Gerasa* is a city of Arabia, and that there is neither sea nor lake near it ; that *Gadara*, a city of Judæa, well known for its warm baths, has neither a deep-lying piece of water with steep banks in its neighborhood, nor is there any sea ; while, near the lake of Tiberias the remains are to be seen of a city called *Gergesa*, near which there is a precipice overlooking the sea, and at which the place is still shown where the herd of swine cast themselves down. The MSS. are divided between these readings after the most capricious fashion. The great majority of the Mnn. in Matthew read Γερασηνῶν ; in Mark and Luke Γεργεσηνῶν. The Latin documents are almost all in favor of Γεργεσηνῶν. Tischendorf (8th edition) reads Γαδαρηνῶν in Matthew, Γερασηνῶν in

* Ver. 26. T. R., with A. R. Γ. Δ. Λ. and 10 other Mjj. many Mnn. Syr., reads Γαδαρηνων. B. D. It. Vg., Γερασηνων. ℵ. L. X. Z. some Mnn. Cop. Epiph., Γεργεσενων. Ver. 27. ℵ. B. E. Z. some Mnn. omit αυτω. ℵ. B., εχων instead of ειχεν. ℵ. B. L. Z. some Mnn., και χρονω ικανων instead of εκ χρονων ικανων και. Ver. 28. ℵ. B. L. X. Z. some Mnn. Syr. It. omit και before ανακραξας. Ver. 29. B. F. M. Λ. Z., παρηγγειλε instead of παρηγγελλεν, which is the reading of T. R. with 16 Mjj. several Mnn. Syr., etc. Ver. 29. The MSS. vary between εδεσμειτο and εδεσμευετο. The MSS. vary between του δαιμονος and του δαιμονιου.

Mark, Γεργεσηνῶν in Luke. Bleek thinks that the primitive Gospel on which, in his opinion, our three Syn. are based, read Γερασηνῶν, but that, owing to the improbability of this reading, it was changed by certain copyists into Γαδαρηνων, and by Origen into Γεργεσηνῶν. Looking simply at the fact, this last name appears to him to agree with it best. In fact, *Gerasa* was a large city situated at a considerable distance to the south-east, on the borders of Arabia ; and the reading Γερασηνῶν can only be admitted by supposing that the district dependent on this city extended as far as to the sea of Galilee, which is inadmissible, although Stephen of Byzantium calls Gerasa a city of Decapolis. *Gadara* is nearer, being only a few leagues from the south-east end of the sea of Galilee. Josephus calls it the metropolis of the Peræa ; Pliny reckons it among the cities of Decapolis. Its suburbs might extend as far as the sea. But it is highly natural to suppose, that these cities, being so well known, the copyists substituted their names for that of *Gergesa*, which was generally unknown. It is a confirmation of this view, that the existence of a town of this name is attested not only by Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, but by the recent discovery of ruins bearing the name of *Gersa* or *Khersa*, toward the embouchure of the Wady Semakh. The course of the walls is still visible, according to Thompson (p. 375). This traveller also says, that "the sea is so near the foot of the mountain at this spot, that animals having once got fairly on to the incline could not help rolling down into the water" (p. 377). Wilson (*Athenæum*, 1866, i. p. 438) states that this place answers all the conditions of the Bible narrative.* The true reading, therefore, would be Γεργεσηνῶν or Γεργεσαίων. This name so little known must have been altered first into Γερασηνῶν, which has some resemblance to it, and then into Γαδαρηνῶν.†

On the demoniacs, see 4 : 33. The 27th verse gives a description of the demoniac, which is afterward finished in the 29th. This first description (ver. 27) only contains that which presented itself *immediately* to the observation of an eye-witness of the scene. The second and fuller description (ver. 29) is accounted for by the command of Jesus, which, to be intelligible, required a more detailed statement of the state of the possessed. This interruption, which is not found in Mark, reflects very naturally the impression of an eye-witness ; it demonstrates the independence of the respective narratives of Matthew and Luke. The plural δαιμόνια (*demons*), explained afterward (ver. 30) by the afflicted man himself, refers doubtless to the serious nature and multiplicity of the symptoms—melancholy, mania, violence, occasioned by a number of relapses (see on 8 : 3 and 11 : 24-26). His refusing to wear clothes or remain in a house is connected with that alienation from society which characterizes such states. The Alex. reading : "who for a long while past had worn no clothes," is evidently an error. The note of time cannot refer to a circumstance altogether so subordinate as that of clothing. The Levitical uncleanness of the tombs insured to this man the solitude he sought. The sight of Jesus appears to have produced an extraordinary impression upon him. The holy, calm, gentle majesty, tender compassion, and conscious sovereignty which were expressed in the aspect of our Lord,

* We cite these two authors from M. Konrad Furrer : "Die Bedeutung der bibl. Geographie," p. 19.

† M. Heer has recently proposed ("Der Kirchenfreund," 13th May, 1870), a view which would more easily account for the reading *Gerasa* found in the MSS. by Origen : The original name of the place *Gergesa*, abbreviated into *Gersa*, might be altered in popular speech into *Gerasa*, which it would be necessary not to confound with the name of the Arabian city.

awakened in him, by force of contrast, the humbling consciousness of his own state of moral disorder. He felt himself at once attracted and repelled by this man ; this led to a violent crisis in him, which revealed itself first of all in a cry. Then, like some ferocious beast submitting to the power of his subduer, he runs and kneels, protesting all the while, in the name of the spirit of which he is still the organ, against the power which is exerted over him. Luke says : προσπίπτειν, not προσκυνεῖν (Mark). The former term does not imply any religious feeling. On the expression : *What have I to do with thee?* see on 4 : 24. The name *Jesus* is wanting in Matthew, and it looks strange. How did he know this name? Perhaps he had heard Jesus talked of, and instinctively recognized Him. Or perhaps there was a supernatural knowledge appertaining to this extraordinary state. The expression : *Son of the most high God* is explained by the prevalence of polytheism in those countries where there was a large heathen population. Josephus calls Gadara *a Greek city*. We must not infer from this that this man was a heathen.

In his petition, ver. 28, the demoniac still identifies himself with the alien spirit which holds him in his power. The torment which he dreads is being sent away *into the abyss* (ver. 31) ; Matthew adds, *before the time*. The power of acting on the world, for beings that are alienated from God and move only within the void of their own subjectivity, is a temporary solace to their unrest. To be deprived of this power is for them just what a return to prison is for the captive. If we read παρήγγειλε, we must give this aor. the meaning of a plus perfect : For He *had commanded*. But MS. authority is rather in favor of the imperf. παρήγελλεν : "For *He was commanding him*." This tense indicates a continuous action which does not immediately produce its effect. The demon's cry of distress, *Torment me not*, is called forth by the strong and continued pressure which the command of Jesus put upon him. This imperf. corresponds with Mark's ἔλεγε γάρ. We find in these two analogous forms the common type of the traditional narration. The *for*, which follows, explains this imperfect. The evil did not yield instantly, because it had taken too deep root. Συνηρπάκει, *it kept him in its possession*. Πολλοῖς χρόνοις may signify *for a long time past* or *oftentimes*. With the second sense, there would be an allusion to a series of relapses, each of which had aggravated the evil.

Vers. 30–33.* *The Cure.*—To this prayer, in which the victim became involuntarily the advocate of his tormentor, Jesus replies by putting a question : He asks the afflicted man his name. For what purpose? There is nothing so suitable as a calm and simple question to bring a madman to himself. Above all, there is no more natural way of awakening in a man who is beside himself the consciousness of his own personality, than to make him tell his own name. A man's name becomes the expression of his character, and a summary of the history of his life. Now, the first condition of any cure of this afflicted man was a return to the distinct feeling of his own personality. There was at this time a word which, more than any other, called up the idea of the resistless might of the conqueror under whom Israel was then suffering oppression. This was the word Legion. The sound of this word called up the thought of those victorious armies before which the whole world bowed down. So it is by this term that this afflicted man describes the power which oppresses him

* Ver. 30. ℵ B. Syr^{sch}. It. omit λεγων. Ver. 31. The MSS. vary between παρεκαλουν and παρεκαλει. Ver. 32. The MSS. vary between βοσκομενη and βοσκομενων. ℵ^{c} B. C. L. Z. some Mnn. It^{plerique}, παρεκαλεσαν instead of παρεκαλουν.

and with which he still confounds himself. The expression, *many demons*, is explained by the multiplicity and diversity of the symptoms (ver. 29). To this answer the demoniac adds, in the name of his tyrant, a fresh request. The demon understands that he must release his prey; but he does not want to enter forthwith into a condition in which contact with terrestrial realities would be no longer possible to him. In Mark there is here found the strange expression: "not to send them out of the country," which may mean, *to the desert*, where unclean but not captive spirits were thought to dwell, or into *the abyss*, whence they went forth to find a temporary abode upon the earth. The sequel shows that the second meaning must be preferred. Jesus makes no answer to this request. His silence is ordinarily regarded as signifying consent. But the silence of Jesus simply means that He insists on the command which He has just given. When He wishes to reply in the affirmative—as, for instance, at the end of ver. 32—he does so distinctly. This explanation is confirmed by Matthew, "If thou cast us out . . ." Their request to enter into the swine only refers, therefore, to the way by which they were suffered to go into the abyss. What is the explanation of this request, and of the permission which Jesus accorded to it? As to these evil spirits, we can understand that it might be pleasant to them, before losing all power of action, to find one more opportunity of doing an injury. Jesus, on his part, has in view a twofold result. The Jewish exorcists, in order to assure their patients that they were cured, were accustomed to set a pitcher of water or some other object in the apartment where the expulsion took place, which the demon took care to upset in going out. What they were accustomed to do as charlatans, Jesus sees it good to do as a physician. The identification of the sick man with his demon had been a long-existing fact of consciousness (vers. 27 and 29). A decisive sign of the reality of the departure of the evil power was needed to give the possessed perfect assurance of his deliverance. Besides this reason, there was probably another. The theocratic feeling of Jesus had been wounded by the sight of these immense herds of animals which the law declared unclean. Such an occupation as this showed how completely the line of demarcation between Judaism and paganism was obliterated in this country. Jesus desired, by a sensible judgment, to reclaim the people, and prevent their being still more unjudaized.

The influence exerted by the demons on the herd was in no sense a possession. None but a moral being can be morally possessed. But we know that several species of animals are accessible to collective influences—that swine, in particular, readily yield to panics of terror. The idea that it was the demoniac himself who frightened them, by throwing himself into the herd, is incompatible with the text. Mark, whose narrative is always distinguished by the exactness of its details, says that the number of the swine was about two thousand. An item of his own invention, says De Wette; an appendix of later tradition, according to Bleek; here we see the necessary consequence of the critical system, according to which Mark is supposed to have made use of the text of the other two, or of a document common to them all. The number 2000 cannot serve to prove the individual possession of the swine by the demons (*legion*, ver. 30), for a legion comprised 4000 men. The question has been asked, Had Jesus the right to dispose in this way of other people's property? One might as well ask whether Peter had the right to dispose of the lives of Ananias and Sapphira! It is one of those cases in which the power, by its very nature, guarantees the right.

Vers. 34–39.* *The Effect produced.*—First, on the people of the country; next, on the afflicted man. The owners of the herd dwelt in the city and neighborhood. They came to convince themselves with their own eyes of the loss of which they had been informed by the herdsmen. On reaching the spot they beheld a sight which impressed them deeply. The demoniac was known all through the country, and was an object of universal terror. They found him calm and restored. So great a miracle could not fail to reveal to them the power of God, and awaken their conscience. Their fears were confirmed by the account given them of the scene which had just occurred by persons who were with Jesus, and had witnessed it (*οἱ ἰδόντες*, ver. 36). These persons were not the herdsmen; for the cure was wrought at a considerable distance from the place where the herd was feeding (Matt. 8 : 36). They were the apostles and the people who had passed over the sea with them (Mark 4 : 36). The *καί*, *also*, is undoubtedly authentic; the latter account was supplementary to that of the herdsmen, which referred principally to the loss of the herd. The fear of the inhabitants was doubtless of a superstitious nature. But Jesus did not wish to force Himself upon them, for it was still the season of grace, and grace limits itself to making its offers. He yielded to the request of the inhabitants, who, regarding Him as a judge, dreaded further and still more terrible chastisement at His hand. He consents, therefore, to depart from them, but not without leaving them a witness of His grace in the person of him who had become a living monument of it. The restored man, who feels his moral existence linked as it were to the person of Jesus, begs to be permitted to accompany Him. Jesus was already in the ship, Mark tells us. He does not consent to this entreaty. In Galilee, where it was necessary to guard against increasing the popular excitement, He forbade those He healed publishing abroad their cure. But in this remote country, so rarely visited by Him, and which He was obliged to leave so abruptly, He needed a missionary to testify to the greatness of the Messianic work which God was at this time accomplishing for His people. There is a fine contrast between the expression of Jesus: "What God hath done for thee," and that of the man: "What Jesus had done for him." Jesus refers all to God; but the afflicted man could not forget the instrument. The whole of the latter part of the narrative is omitted in Matthew. Mark indicates the field of labor of this new apostle as comprising not his own city merely, but the whole of the Decapolis.

Volkmar applies here his system of allegorical interpretation This incident is nothing, according to him, but the symbolical representation of the work of Paul among the Gentiles. The demoniac represents the heathen world; the chains with which they tried to bind him are legislative enactments, such as those of Lycurgus and Solon; the swine, the obscenities of idolatry; the refusal of Jesus to yield to the desire of the restored demoniac, when he wished to accompany Him, the obstacles which Jewish Christians put in the way of the entrance of the converted heathen into the Church; the request that Jesus would withdraw, the irritation caused in heathen countries by the success of Paul (the riot at Ephesus, *ex. gr.*). Keim is opposed to this unlimited allegorizing, which borders, indeed, on absurdity. He very properly objects, that the demoniac is not even (as is the case with the Canaanitish

* Ver. 34. The MSS. vary between *γεγονος* and *γεγενημενον*. *Απελθοντες*, in the T. R., is only read in a few Mnn. Ver. 35. ℵ* B., *εξηλθεν* instead of *εξεληλυθει*. Ver. 36. ℵ. B. C. D. L. P. X. some Mnn. and Vss. omit *και* before *οι ιδοντες*. Ver. 37. The MSS. vary between *ηρωτησαν* (Byz.) and *ηρωτησεν* (Alex.). ℵ* L. P. X., *Γεργεσηνων*. B. C. D. It. Vg., *Γερασηνων* instead of *Γαδαρηνων*, which is the reading of T. R. with 14 Mjj. many Mnn. Syr.

woman) spoken of as a heathen ; that the precise locality, so little known, to which the incident is referred, is a proof of its historical reality ; that the request to Jesus to leave the country is a fact without any corresponding example, which does not look like imitation, but has the very features of truth. In short, he only objects to the episode of the swine, which appears to him to be a legendary amplification. But is it likely that the preachers of the gospel would have admitted into their teaching an incident so remarkable, if it could be contradicted by the population of a whole district, which is distinctly pointed out? If possession is only, as Keim thinks, an ordinary malady, this conclusion is certainly inevitable. But if there is any degree of reality attaching to the mysterious notion of possession, it would be difficult to determine *à priori* what might not result from such a state. The picture forms a whole, in which each incident implies all the rest. The request made to Jesus to leave the country, in which Keim acknowledges a proof of authenticity, is only explained by the loss of the swine. Keim admits too much or too little. Either Volkmar and his absurdities, or the frank acceptance of the narrative—this is the only alternative (comp. Heer's fine work, already referred to, "Kirchenfreund," Nos. 10 and 11, 1870).

11. *The Raising of Jairus' Daughter* : 8 : 40–56.—In Mark and Luke, the following incident follows immediately on the return from the Decapolis. According to Luke, the multitude which He had left behind Him when He went away had not dispersed ; they were expecting Him, and received Him on His landing. According to Mark, it collected together again as soon as His arrival was known. In Matthew, two facts are interposed between His arrival and the resurrection of Jairus' daughter —the healing of the paralytic of Capernaum, and the calling of the Apostle Matthew. As the publican's house was probably situated near the port, the second of these facts might certainly have happened immediately on His landing ; but, in any case, the feast given by the publican could not have taken place until the evening, and after what occurred in the house of Jairus. But the same supposition will not apply to the healing of the paralytic, which must be assigned to quite another time, as is the case with Mark and Luke.

Vers. 40–42.* *The Request.*—The term ἀποδέχεσθαι indicates a warm welcome. Mark and Luke mention the age of the young girl, which Matthew omits. The circumstance of her being an only daughter, added by Luke, more fully explains the father's distress. Criticism, of course, does not fail to draw its own conclusions from the same circumstance being found already in 7 : 12. As if an only son and an only daughter could not both be found in Israel! According to Mark and Luke, the young girl was dying ; in Matthew she is already dead. This evangelist tells the story here, as elsewhere, in a summary manner ; he combines in a single message the arrival of the father, and the subsequent arrival of the messenger announcing her death. The process is precisely similar to that already noticed in the account of the healing of the centurion's servant. Matthew is interested simply in the fact of the miracle and the word of Jesus.

Vers. 43–48.† *The Interruption.*—The preposition πρός, in προσαναλώσασα, expresses the fact that, in addition to these long sufferings, she now found herself destitute of

* Ver. 40. ℵ^{ca}. B. L. R. some Mnn. Syr., εν δε τω instead of εγενετο δε εν τω. Ver. 42. C. D. P., πορευεσθαι instead of υπαγειν. C. L. U., συνεθλιβον for συνεπνιγον.

† Ver. 43. All the Mjj., ιατροις instead of εις ιατρους, which is the reading of T. R. with some Mnn. Ver. 45. The mss. vary between οι συν αυτω (Alex.) and οι μετα αυτου (T. R. Byz.). ℵ. B. L. some Mnn. omit the words και λεγει . . . μου. Ver. 46. ℵ. B. L., εξεληλυθυιαν instead of εξελθουσαν. Ver. 47. 9 Mjj. Syr. It. Vg. omit αυτω after απηγγειλεν. Ver. 48. ℵ. B. D. L. Z. some Mnn. and Vss. omit θαρσει.

resources. Mark expresses with a little more force the injury which the physicians had done her. Hitzig and Holtzmann maintain that Luke, being a physician himself, intentionally tones down these details from the proto-Mark. We find nothing here but Mark's characteristic amplification. The malady from which this woman suffered rendered her Levitically unclean ; it was even, according to the law, a sufficient justification for a divorce (Lev. 15 : 25 ; Deut. 24 : 1). Hence, no doubt, her desire to get cured as it were by stealth, without being obliged to make a public avowal of her disorder. The faith which actuated her was not altogether free from superstition, for she conceived of the miraculous power of Jesus as acting in a purely physical manner. The word *κράσπεδον*, which we translate by *the hem* (of the garment), denotes one of the four tassels or tufts of scarlet woollen cord attached to the four corners of the outer robe, which were intended to remind the Israelites of their law. Their name was *zitzit* (Num. 15 : 38). As this robe, which was of a rectangular form, was worn like a woman's shawl, two of the corners being allowed to hang down close together on the back, we see the force of the expression *came behind*. Had it been, as is ordinarily understood, the lower hem of the garment which she attempted to touch, she could not have succeeded, on account of the crowd which surrounded Jesus. This word *κράσπεδον*, according to Passow, comes from *κέρας* and *πέδον*, the forward part of a plain ; or better, according to Schleusner, from *κεκραμένον εἰς πέδον*, *that which hangs down toward the ground*. Both Mark and Luke date the cure from the moment that she touched. Matthew speaks of it as taking place a little later, and as the effect of Jesus' word. But this difference belongs, as we shall see, to Matthew's omission of the following details, and not to any difference of view as to the efficient cause of the cure.

The difficulty about this miracle is, that it seems to have been wrought outside the consciousness and will of Jesus, and thus appears to be of a magical character. In each of Jesus' miracles there are, as it were, two poles : the receptivity of the person who is the subject of it, and the activity of Him by whom it is wrought. The maximum of action in one of these factors may correspond with the minimum of action in the other. In the case of the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda, in whom it was necessary to excite even the desire to be cured, as well as in the raising of the dead, the human receptivity was reduced to its minimum. The activity of the Lord in these cases reached its highest degree of initiation and intensity. In the present instance it is the reverse. The receptivity of the woman reaches such a degree of energy that it snatches, as it were, the cure from Jesus. The action of Jesus is here confined to that willingness to bless and save which always animated Him in His relations with men. He did not, however, remain unconscious of the virtue which He had just put forth ; but He perceives that there is a tincture of superstition in the faith which had acted in this way toward Him ; and, as Riggenbach admirably shows ("Leben Jesu," p. 442), His design in what follows is to purify this incipient faith. But in order to do this it is necessary to discover the author of the deed. There is no reason for not attributing to Jesus the ignorance implied in the question, "Who touched me?" Anything like feigning ignorance ill comports with the candor of His character. Peter shows His usual forwardness, and ventures to remonstrate with Jesus. But, so far from this detail implying any ill-will toward this apostle, Luke attributes the same fault to the other apostles, and equally without any sinister design, since Mark does the same thing (ver. 31). Jesus does not stop to rebuke His disciples ; He pursues His inquiry ; only He now substitutes the assertion,

Somebody hath touched me, for the question, *Who touched me?* Further, He no longer lays stress upon the person, but upon the act, in reply to the observation of Peter, which tended to deny it. The verb ἅψασθαι, *to feel about*, denotes a voluntary, deliberate touch, and not merely an accidental contact. Mark adds that, while putting this question, He cast around Him a scrutinizing glance. The reading ἐξεληλυθυῖαν (Alex.) signifies properly: "I feel myself in the condition of a man from whom a force has been withdrawn." This is somewhat artificial. The received reading, ἐξελθοῦσαν, merely denotes the outgoing of a miraculous power, which is more simple. Jesus had been inwardly apprised of the influence which He had just exerted.

The joy of success gives the woman courage to acknowledge both her act and her malady; but the words, *before all the people*, are designed to show how much this avowal cost her. Luke says *trembling*, to which Mark adds *fearing;* she feels afraid of having sinned against the Lord by acting without His knowledge. He reassures her (ver. 48), and confirms her in the possession of the blessing which she had in some measure taken by stealth. This last incident is also brought out by Mark (ver. 34). The intention of Jesus, in the inquiry He had just instituted, appears more especially in the words, *Thy faith hath saved thee;* thy faith, and not, as thou wast thinking, the material touch. Jesus thus assigns to the moral sphere (in Luke and Mark as well as in Matthew) the virtue which she referred solely to the physical sphere. The word θάρσει, *take courage*, which is wanting in several Alex., is probably taken from Matthew. The term *saved* implies more than the healing of the body. Her recovered health is a link which henceforth will attach her to Jesus as the personification of salvation; and this link is to her the beginning of salvation in the full sense of the term. The words in Matthew, "And the woman was healed from that same hour," refer to the time occupied by the incident, taken altogether.

Eusebius says (H. E. vii. 18, ed. Lœmmer) that this woman was a heathen and dwelt at Paneas, near the source of the Jordan, and that in his time her house was still shown, having at its entrance two brass statues on a stone pedestal. One represented a woman on her knees, with her hands held out before her, in the attitude of a suppliant; the other, a man standing with his cloak thrown over his shoulder, and his hand extended toward the woman. Eusebius had been into the house himself, and had seen this statue, which represented, it was said, the features of Jesus.

Vers. 49–56.* *The Prayer granted.*—We may imagine how painful this delay had been for the father of the child. The message, which just at this moment is brought to him, reduces him to despair. Matthew, in his very summary account, omits all these features of the story; and interpreters, like De Wette, who maintain that this Gospel was the source of the other two, are obliged to regard the details in Mark and Luke as just so many embellishments of their own invention! The present πίστευε, in the received reading, signifies: "Only persevere, without fainting, in the faith which thou hast shown thus far." Some Alex. read the aor. πιστεῦσον: "Only exercise faith! Make a new effort in view of the unexpected difficulty which has

* Ver. 49. ℵ. B. L. X. Z. some Mnn. omit αυτω ℵ. B. D., μηκετι instead of μη. Ver. 50. 6 Mjj. some Mnn. Syr. It. omit λεγων after αυτω. B. L. Z., πιστευσον instead of πιστευε. Ver. 51. T. R., with D. V. some Mnn., εισελθων instead of ελθων. The MSS. vary between τινα and ουδενα. The MSS. vary between Ιωαννην και Ιακωβον and Ιακωβον και Ιωαννην (taken from Mark). Ver. 52. 8 Mjj. some Mnn. Syr. It., ου γαρ instead of ουκ before απεθανεν. Ver. 54. ℵ. B. D. L. X. some Mnn. and Vss. omit εκβαλων εξω παντας και, which is the reading of T. R. with all the rest (taken from Matthew).

arisen." This second meaning seems to agree better with the position of *μόνον, only,* before the verb. Perhaps the other reading is taken from Mark, where all the authorities read *πίστευε.*

The reading of the T. R., *εἰσελθών, having entered,* ver. 51, is not nearly so well supported as the reading *ἐλθών, having come.* But with either reading there is a distinction observed between the arrival (*ἐλθών*) or entrance (*εἰσελθών*) into the *house* and the entrance into the chamber of the sick girl, to which the *εἰσελθεῖν* which follows refers: "He suffered no man to go in." What obliges us to give this sense to this infinitive, is the mention of the mother among the persons excepted from the prohibition; for if here also entrance into the house was in question, this would suppose that the mother had left it, which is scarcely probable, when her daughter had only just expired. Jesus' object in only admitting just the indispensable witnesses into the room, was to diminish as far as possible the fame of the work He was about to perform. As to the three apostles, it was necessary that they should be present, in order that they might be able afterward to testify to what was done.

The following scene, vers. 52, 53, took place at the entrance of the sick chamber. The *πάντες, all,* are the servants, neighbors, relations, and professional mourners (*αὐλῆται,* Matthew) assembled in the vestibule, who also wanted to make their way into the chamber. Olshausen, Neander, and others infer from Jesus' words, that the child was simply in a lethargy; but this explanation is incompatible with the expression *εἰδότες, knowing well,* ver. 53. If this had been the idea of the writer, he would have employed the word *δοκοῦντες, believing that . . .* On the rest of the verse, see 7 : 14. By the words, "She is not dead, but sleepeth," Jesus means that, in the order of things over which He presides, death is death no longer, but assumes the character of a temporary slumber (John 11 : 11, explained by ver. 14). Baur maintains that Luke means, ver. 53, that the apostles also joined in the laugh against Jesus, and that it is with this in view that the evangelist has chosen the general term *all* (ver. 52; Evang. p. 458). In this case it would be necessary to include among the *πάντες* the father and mother!! The words, *having put them all out,* in the T. R., are a gloss derived from Mark and Matthew. It has arisen in this way: Mark expressly mentions two separate dismissals, one of the crowd and nine apostles at the entrance of the house, and another of the people belonging to the house not admitted into the chamber of the dead (ver. 40) As in Luke, the word *enter* (ver. 51) had been wrongly referred to the first of these acts, it was thought necessary to mention here the second, at first in the margin, and afterward in the text, in accordance with the parallel passages. The command to give the child something to eat (ver. 55) is related by Luke alone. It shows the perfect calmness of the Lord when performing the most wonderful work. He acts like a physician who has just felt the pulse of his patient, and gives instructions respecting his diet for the day. Mark, who is fond of local coloring, has preserved the Aramæan form of the words of Jesus, also the graphic detail, *immediately the child began to walk about.* In these features of the narrative we recognize the account of an eye-witness, in whose ear the voice of Jesus still sounds, and who still sees the child that had been brought to life again moving about. Matthew omits all details. The fact itself simply is all that has any bearing on the Messianic demonstration, which is his object. Thus each follows his own path while presenting the common substratum of fact as tradition had preserved it. On the prohibition of Jesus, ver. 56, see on 5 : 14 and 8 : 39.

According to Volkmar, the woman with an issue would be only the personification of the believing Jews, in whom their rabbis (the physicians of ver. 43) had been unable to effect a moral cure, but whom Jesus will save after having healed the heathen (the return from Gadara); and the daughter of Jairus represents the dead Judiasm of the synagogue, which the gospel alone can restore to life. Keim acknowledges the insufficiency of symbolism to explain such narratives. He admits the cure of the woman as a fact, but maintains that she herself, by her faith, was the sole contributor toward it. In the resurrection of the daughter of Jairus, he sees either a myth, modelled after the type of the resurrection of the Shunammite widow's son by Elisha (a return to Strauss), or a natural awaking from a lethargy (a return to Paulus). But is not the local coloring quite as decided in this narrative as in that of the possessed of Gadara, of which Keim on this ground maintains the historical truth? And as to an awakening from a lethargy, what has he to reply to Zeller? (See p. 218, note.)

FOURTH CYCLE.—9 : 1–50.

From the Mission of the Twelve to the Departure from Galilee.

This cycle describes the close of the Galilean ministry. It embraces six narrations: 1*st*. The mission of the Twelve, and the impression made on Herod by the public activity of Jesus (9 : 1–9). 2*d*. The multiplication of the loaves (vers. 10–17). 3*d*. The first communication made by Jesus to His apostles respecting His approaching sufferings (vers. 18–27). 4*th*. The transfiguration (vers. 28–36). 5*th*. The cure of the lunatic child (vers. 37–43*a*). 6*th*. Some circumstances which preceded the departure from Galilee (vers. 43*b* to 50).

1. *The Mission of the Twelve, and the Fears of Herod:* 9 : 1–9.—The mission with which the Twelve were intrusted marks a twofold advance in the work of Jesus. From the first Jesus had attached to Himself a great number of pious Jews as disciples (a first example occurs, vers. 1–11; a second, ver. 27); from these He had chosen twelve to form a permanent college of apostles (6 . 12 *et seq.*). And now this last title is to become a more complete reality than it had hitherto been. Jesus sends them forth to the people of Galilee, and puts them through their first apprenticeship in their future mission, as it were, under His own eyes. With this advance in their position corresponds another belonging to the work itself. For six months Jesus devoted Himself almost exclusively to Galilee. The shores of the lake of Gennesaret, the western plateau Decapolis itself on the eastern side, had all been visited by Him in turn. Before this season of grace for Galilee comes to an end, He desires to address one last solemn appeal to the conscience of this people on whom such lengthened evangelistic labors have been spent; and He does it by this mission, which He confides to the Twelve, and which is, as it were, the close of His own ministry. Mark also connects this portion with the preceding cycle by introducing between the two the visit to Nazareth (6 : 1–6), which, as a last appeal of the Saviour to this place, so dear to his heart, perfectly agrees with the position of affairs at this time.

Matthew, chap. 10, also mentions this mission of the Twelve, connecting with it the catalogue of apostles and a long discourse on the apostolate, but he appears to place this fact earlier than Luke. Keim (ii. p. 308) thinks that Luke assigns it a place in nearer connection with the mission of the seventy disciples, in order that this second incident (a pure invention of Luke's) may be more certain to eclipse the former. In imputing to Luke this Machiavellian design against the Twelve, Keim forgets two things. 1. That, according to him, Luke invented the scene of the election of the Twelve (6) with the view of conferring on their ministry a double and

triple consecration. After having had recourse to invention to exalt them, we are to suppose that he now invents to degrade them! 2. That the three Syn. are agreed in placing this mission of the Twelve just after the preceding cycle (the tempest, Gadara, Jairus), and that as Matthew places this cycle, as well as the Sermon on the Mount, which it closely follows, earlier than Luke, the different position which the mission of the Twelve occupies in the one from that which it holds in the other, results very naturally from this fact. It is to be observed that Mark, whose account of the sending forth of the Twelve fully confirms that of Luke, is quite independent of it, as is proved by a number of details which are peculiar to him (6 : 7, *two and two;* ver. 8, *save one staff only;* ibid.. *put on two coats;* ver. 13, *they anointed with oil*).

1*st.* Vers. 1, 2.* *The Mission.*—There is something greater than preaching—this is to make preachers; there is something greater than performing miracles—this is to impart the power to perform them. It is this new stage which the work of Jesus here reaches. He labors to raise His apostles up to His own level. The expression *συγκαλεσάμενος, having called together*, indicates a solemn meeting; it expresses more than the term *προσκαλεῖσθαι, to call to Him*, used in Mark and Matthew. What would Baur have said if the first expression had been found in Matthew and the second in Luke, when throughout Luke's narrative as it is he sees an intention to depreciate this scene in comparison with that which follows, 10 : 1, *et seq.*?

In Jewish estimation, the most divine form of power is that of working miracles. It is with this, therefore, that Jesus begins: *δύναμις*, the power of execution; *ἐξουσία*, the authority which is the foundation of it; the demons will therefore *owe* them obedience, and will not fail, in fact, to *render* it. These two terms are opposed to the anxious and labored practices of the exorcists. *Πάντα*: all the different maladies coming under this head—melancholy, violence, mania, etc. . . . *Θεραπεύειν, to heal*, depends neither on *δύναμις* nor *ἐξουσία*, but on *ἔδωκεν, He gave them;* there is no *ἐξουσία* in regard to diseases. Such will be their power, their weapon. But these cures are not the end; they are only the means designed to lend support to their message. The end is indicated in ver. 2. This is to proclaim throughout Galilee the coming of the kingdom of God, and at the same time to make the people feel the grave importance of the present time. It is a return to the ministry of John the Baptist, and of our Lord's at its commencement (Mark 1 : 15). This undertaking was within the power of the Twelve. "To preach and to heal" means "to preach while healing." Only imagine the messengers of the Lord at the present day traversing our country with the announcement of His second coming being at hand, and confirming their message by miracles. What a sensation such a mission would produce! According to Mark, the Lord sent them *two and two*, which recalls their distribution into pairs, Luke 6 : 13–15; Matt. 10 : 2–4.

2*d.* Vers. 3–5.† *Their Instructions.*—"And He said unto them, Take nothing for your journey, neither staves, nor scrip, neither bread, neither money; neither have two coats apiece. 4. And whatsoever house ye enter into, there abide and thence

* Ver. 1. T. R., with E. F. H. U several Mnn It$^{aliq.}$, reads *μαθητας αυτου* after *δωδεκα* (taken from Matthew); 11 Mjj. 100 Mnn. Syr. omit these words; ℵ. C* L. X. Δ. Z. some Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$, substitute *αποστολους* for them. Ver. 2. B. Syr^{cur} omit *τους ασθενουντας*; ℵ. A. D. L. X. read *τους ασθενεις*.

† Ver. 3. ℵ. B. C* D. E* F. L. M. Z. several Mnn. Syr. It. Eus. read *ραβδον* instead of *ραβδους*, which is the reading of T. R. with 10 Mjj. many Mnn., but which appears taken from Matthew. ℵ. B. C* F. L. Z. omit *ανα*. Ver. 4. Vg., according to C., adds *μη* after *εκειθεν*. Ver. 5. ℵ. B. C. D. L. X. Z. some Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ omit *και*.

depart. 5. And whosoever will not receive you, when ye go out of that city, shake off the very dust from your feet for a testimony against them." Ver. 3 contains instructions for their setting out; ver. 4 instructions respecting their arrival and stay; ver. 5, instructions for leaving each place.

Ver. 3. The feeling of confidence is the key to the injunctions of this verse: "Make no preparations, such as are ordinarily made on the eve of a journey; set out just as you are. God will provide for all your wants." The reply of the apostles, 22:35, proves that this promise was not unfulfilled. Μηδεν, *nothing* is a general negative, to which the subsequent, μήτε, neither . . . nor . . . are subordinate. Mark, who commences with a simple μή, naturally continues with the negative μηδέ, *nor further*. Each writer, though expressing the same idea as the other, has his own particular way of doing it. Luke says, *neither staff*, or, according to another reading, *neither staves;* Matthew is like Luke; Mark, on the contrary, *save one staff only*. The contradiction in terms could not be greater, yet the agreement in idea is perfect. For as far as the sentiment is concerned which Jesus wishes to express, it is all one to say, "nothing, not even a staff" (Matthew and Luke), or, "nothing, except it be simply (or at most) a staff" (Mark). Ebrard makes the acute observation that in Aramæan Jesus probably said, בי אם מטה, *for if . . . a staff*, an elliptical form also much used in Hebrew, and which may be filled up in two ways: For, *if* you take *a staff, this of itself is quite sufficient* (Mark); or, *this of itself is too much* (Matthew and Luke). This saying of Jesus might therefore be reproduced in Greek either in one way or the other. But in no case could these two opposite forms be explained on the hypothesis of a common written Greek source. Bleek, who prefers the expression given in Matthew and Luke, does not even attempt to explain how that in Mark could have originated. If we read *staves*, according to a various reading found in Luke and Matthew, the plural must naturally be applied to the two apostles travelling together. Luke says, *Do not have each* (ἀνά, distributive) two coats, that is to say, each a change of coat, beyond what you wear. As they were not to have a travelling cloak (πήρα), they must have worn the second coat on their person; and it is this idea, implied by Luke, that is exactly expressed by Mark, "neither put on two coats." The infinitive μὴ ἔχειν depends on εἶπε: "He said to them . . . not to have. . . ."

As an unanswerable proof of an opposite tendency in Matthew and Luke, it is usual to cite the omission in this passage of the prohibition with which in Matthew this discourse commences (10:5): "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." But even in Matthew this prohibition is not absolute (*rather*) nor permanent (28:19), "Go and teach *all nations*"). It was therefore a restriction temporarily imposed upon the disciples, in consideration of the privilege accorded to the Jewish nation of being the cradle of the work of the Messiah. With some exceptions, for which there were urgent reasons, Jesus Himself was generally governed by this rule. He says, indeed, in reference to His earthly ministry: "I am not sent save to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 15:24); nevertheless, He is not ignorant that it is His mission to seek and to save *all that which is lost*, and consequently the heathen. He affirms it in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, no less than in that of Luke. Paul himself does homage to this divine fidelity, when he recalls the fact that Jesus, during His earthly life, consented to become *a minister of the circumcision* (Rom. 15:8). But, 1. What reason could Luke have, in the circle for which he was writing, to refer to this restriction temporarily imposed upon the Twelve for the purpose of this particular mission? 2. Mark, no less than Luke, omits these words in the account he gives of this discourse, but the harmony of his leaning with that of the

first evangelist is not suspected. 3. This last circumstance makes it all but certain that this detail had already been omitted in the sources whence these two evangelists drew their narratives, and must completely exculpate Luke from all anti-Jewish prejudice in his reproduction of this discourse.

Ver. 4. On their arrival at a city, they were to settle down in the first house to which they obtained access (*εἰς ἣν ἂν, into whatever house*), which, however, was not to exclude prudence and well-ascertained information (Matthew), and, once settled in a house, they were to keep to it, and try to make it the centre of a divine work in that place. To accept the hospitality of several families in succession would be the means of creating rivalry. It would therefore be from this house also, which was the first to welcome them, that they would have to set out on leaving the place : "till ye go *thence*." The reading of the Vulg. : "Go *not* out of this house," is an erroneous correction. In the primitive churches Christian work was concentrated in certain houses, which continued to be centres of operation (comp. the expression in Paul's epistles, "The church which is in his house").

Ver. 5. The gospel does not force itself upon men ; it is an elastic power, penetrating wherever it finds access, and retiring wherever it is repulsed. This was Jesus' own mode of acting all through His ministry (8 : 37 ; John 3 : 22) The Jews were accustomed, on their return from heathen countries to the Holy Land, to shake off the dust from their feet at the frontier. This act symbolized a breaking away from all joint-participation in the life of the idolatrous world. The apostles were to act in the same way in reference to any Jewish cities which might reject in their person the kingdom of God. Καί, *even* the dust. By this symbolical act they relieved themselves of the burden of all further responsibility on account of the people of that city. The expression, *for a testimony*, with the complement *ἐπ' αὐτούς, upon them*, has evidently reference to the judgment to come ; in Mark the complement *αὐτοῖς, for them*, makes the testimony an immediate appeal to their guilty consciences.

3*d*. Ver. 6. *The Result.*—Διά, in διήρχοντο (*they went through*), has for its complement the country in general, and denotes the extent of their mission. Κατά, which is distributive, expresses the accomplishment of it in detail : "staying in every little town." Only Mark makes mention here of the use of oil in healing the sick—a remarkable circumstance, with which the precept, James 5 : 14, is probably connected. In Matthew the discourse absorbs the attention of the historian to such a degree that he does not say a word, at the end of chap. 10, about the execution of their mission.

This short address, giving the Twelve their instructions, is only the preamble in Matthew (chap. 10) to a much more extended discourse, in which Jesus addresses the apostles respecting their future ministry in general. Under the influence of his fixed idea, Baur maintains that Luke purposely abridged the discourse in Matthew, in order to diminish the importance of the mission of the Twelve, and bring out in bolder relief that of the seventy disciples (Luke 10). "We see," he says, "that every word here, so to speak, is too much for the evangelist" ("Evangel." p. 435). But, 1. If Luke had been animated by the jealous feeling with this criticism imputes to him, and so had allowed himself to tamper with the history, would he have put the election of the Twelve (chap. 6), as distinct from their first mission, into such prominence, when Matthew appears to confound these two events (10 : 1–4)? Would he mention so expressly the success of their mission, as he does, ver. 6, while Matthew himself preserves complete silence upon this point? It is fortunate for Luke that their respective parts were not changed, as they might have been and very innocently, so far as he is concerned. He would have had to pay smartly for his omission in the

hands of such critics! 2. Mark (6 : 8–10) gives this discourse in exactly the same form as Luke, and not at all after Matthew's manner; he, however, is not suspected of any antipathy to the Twelve. It follows from this, that Mark and Luke have simply given the discourse as they found it, either in a common document (the primitive Mark, according to Holtzmann), or in documents of a very similar character, to which they had access. There is sufficient proof, from a comparison of ver. 6 in Luke with ver. 13 in Mark, that of these two suppositions the latter must be preferred. 3. We may add, lastly, that in the discourse *on the apostolate* (Matt. 10) it is easy to recognize the same characteristics already observed in the Sermon on the Mount. It is a composition of a *didactic* nature on a definite subject, in which fragments of very different discourses, speaking chronologically, are collected into a single discourse. "The instructions it contains," Holtzmann rightly observes (p. 183), "go far beyond the actual situation, and imply a much more advanced state of things. . . ." Bleek, Ewald, and Hilgenfeld also recognize the more evident indications of anticipation. We find the true place for the greater part of the passages grouped together in Matthew, under the heading, *general instructions on the apostolate*, in Luke 12 and 21. For all these reasons, we regard the accusation brought against Luke respecting this discourse as scientifically untenable.

4th. Vers. 7–9.* *The Fears of Herod.*—This passage in Matthew (ch. 14) is separated by several chapters from the preceding narrative; but it is connected with it both chronologically and morally by Luke and Mark (6 : 14, *et seq.*). It was, in fact, the stir created by this mission of the Twelve which brought the fame of Jesus to Herod's ears ("for His name was spread abroad," Mark 6 : 14). The idea of this prince, which Luke mentions, that Jesus might be John risen from the dead, is the only indication which is to be found in this evangelist of the murder of the forerunner. But for the existence of this short passage in Luke it would have been laid down as a critical axiom that Luke was ignorant of the murder of John the Baptist! The saying, Elias or one of the old prophets, meant a great deal—nothing less, in the language of that time, than the Messiah is at hand (Matt. 16 : 14, John 1 : 21, *et seq.*) In Matthew and Mark the supposition that Jesus is none other than the forerunner risen from the dead proceeds from Herod himself. In Luke this apprehension is suggested to him by popular rumor, which is certainly more natural. The repetition of ἐγώ, *I*, is, as Meyer says, the echo of an alarmed conscience. The remarkable detail, which Luke alone has preserved, that Herod sought to have a private interview with Jesus, indicates an original source of information closely connected with this king. Perhaps it reached Luke, or the author of the document of which he availed himself, by means of some one of those persons whom Luke describes so exactly, 8 : 3 and Acts 13 : 1, and who belonged to Herod's household.

2. *The Multiplication of the Loaves:* 9 : 10–17.—This narrative is the only one in the entire Galilean ministry which is common to the four evangelists (Matt. 14 : 13, *et seq.*; Mark 6 : 30, *et seq.*; John 6). It forms, therefore, an important mark of connection between the synoptical narrative and John's. This miracle is placed, in all four Gospels alike, at the apogee of the Galilean ministry. Immediately after it, in the Syn., Jesus begins to disclose to His apostles the mystery of His approaching sufferings (Luke 9 : 18–27; Matt. 16 : 13–28; Mark 8 : 27–38); in John this miracle leads to an important crisis in the work of Jesus in Galilee, and the discourse which follows alludes to the approaching violent death of the Lord (6 : 53–56).

* Ver. 7. ℵ. B. C. D. L. Z. omit υπ' αυτου. The same and 10 Mnn., ηγερθη instead of εγηγερται. Ver. 8. The Alex. τις instead of εις. Ver. 9. ℵ. B. C. L. Z. omit ενω before απεκεφαλισα.

1*st.* Vers. 10, 11.* *The Occasion.*—According to Luke, the motive which induced Jesus to withdraw into a desert place was His desire for more privacy with His disciples that He might talk with them of their experiences during their mission. Mark relates, with a slight difference, that His object was to secure them some rest after their labors, there being such a multitude constantly going and coming as to leave them no leisure. According to Matthew, it was the news of the murder of the forerunner which led Jesus to seek solitude with His disciples ; which, however, could in no way imply that He sought in this way to shield Himself from Herod's violence. For how could He, if this were so, have entered the very next day into the dominions of this sovereign (Matt. 14 : 34 ; comp. with Mark and John) ? All these facts prove the mutual independence of the Syn. ; they are easily harmonized, if we only suppose that the intelligence of the murder of John was communicated to Jesus by His apostles on their return from their mission, that it made Him feel deeply the approach of His own end (on the relation between these two deaths, see Matt. 17 : 12), and that it was while He was under these impressions that He desired to secure a season of retirement for His disciples, and an opportunity for more private intercourse with them.

The reading of the T. R. : *in a desert place of the city called Bethsaïda,* is the most complete, but for this very reason the most doubtful, since it is probably made up out of the others. The reading of the principal Alex., *in a city called Bethsaïda,* omits the notion, so important in this passage, of *a desert place,* probably because it appeared inconsistent with the idea of a *city,* and specially of Bethsaïda, where Jesus was so well known. The reading of ℵ and of the Cureton Syriac translation, *in a desert place,* is attractive for its brevity. But whence came the mention of Bethsaïda in all the other variations ? Of the two contradictory notions, the desert and Bethsaïda, this reading sacrifices the proper name, as the preceding had sacrificed the desert. The true reading, therefore, appears to me to be that which is preserved in the Syriac version of Schaaf and in the Italic, *in a desert place called Bethsaïda.* This reading retains the two ideas, the apparent inconsistency of which has led to all these alterations of the text, but in a more concise and at the same time more correct form than that of the received reading. It makes mention not of a city, but of an inhabited country on the shore of the lake, bearing the name of Bethsaïda. If by this expression Luke had intended to denote the city of Bethsaïda between Capernaum and Tiberias, on the western side of the lake, the country of Peter, Andrew, and Philip, he would be in open contradiction to Matthew, Mark, and John, who place the multiplication of the loaves on the eastern side, since in all three Jesus crosses the sea the next day to return to Galilee (*into the country of Gennesareth,* Matt. 14 : 34 ; *to Bethsaïda,* on the western shore, Mark 6 : 45 ;† *to Capernaum,* John 6 : 49). But in this case Luke would contradict himself as well as the others. For Bethsaïda, near Capernaum, being situated in the centre of the sphere of the activity of Jesus, how could the Lord repair thither with the intention of finding a place of retirement, a desert place ? The meaning of the name Bethsaïda (*fishing place*) naturally leads us to suppose that there were several

* Ver. 10. T R. with 14 Mjj. several Mnn., τοπον ερημον πολεως καλουμενης Βηθσαιδα. ℵ^{ca}. B. L. X. Z. (Tisch. 8th ed.), πολιν καλουμενην Βηθσαιδα. Syr^{sch}. It. Vulg., τοπον ερημον καλουμενον Βηθσαιδα. ℵ* Syr^{cur}., τοπον ερημον. Ver. 11. The mss. are divided between δεξαμενος and αποδεξαμενος.

† It is really incredible that Klostermann should have been induced to adopt an interpretation so forced as that which connects the words προς Βηθσαιδάν with the following proposition, by making them depend on ἀπολύση : " until He had sent away the people to Bethsaïda !"

fisheries along the lake of this name. The term Bethsaïda of *Galilee*, John 12 : 21, confirms this supposition : for this epithet must have served to distinguish this Bethsaïda from some other. Lastly, Josephus (Antiq. xviii. 2. 1 ; Bell. Jud. iii. 10. 7) and Pliny (v. 15) expressly mention another Bethsaïda, situated in Gaulonitis, at the northeast extremity of the sea of Galilee, near the embouchure of the Jordan. The tetrarch Philip had built (probably in the vicinity of a district of this country called Bethsaïda), a city, which he had named, after a daughter of Augustus, Bethsaïda-*Julias* the ruins of which Pococke believes he has discovered on a hill, the name of which (Telui) seems to signify *mountain of Julia* (Morgenl. ii. p. 106).* There Jesus would more easily find the solitude which He sought.

The term, ὑπεχώρησε, *He withdrew*, does not inform us whether Jesus made the journey on foot or by boat. Luke doubtless did not know ; he confines himself to reproducing his information. The three other narratives apprise us that the journey was made by water, but that the crowds which, contrary to the intention of Jesus, knew of His departure, set out to follow Him πεζῇ, *on foot* (Matthew and Mark), by land, and that the more eager of them arrived almost as soon as Jesus, and even, according to the more probable reading in Mark, *before* Him. The bend of the lake at the northern end approximates so closely to a straight line that the journey from Capernaum to Julias might be made as quickly by land as by sea.† The unexpected arrival of the people defeated the plan of Jesus. But He was too deeply moved by the love shown for Him by this multitude, like sheep without a shepherd (Mark), to give them anything but a tender welcome (δεξάμενος, Luke) ; and while these crowds of people were flocking up one after another (John 6 : 5), a loving thought ripened in His heart. John has disclosed it to us (6 : 4). It was the time of the Passover. He could not visit Jerusalem with His disciples, owing to the virulent hatred of which He had become the object. In this unexpected gathering, resembling that of the nation at Jerusalem, He discerns a signal from on high, and determines to celebrate a feast in the desert, as a compensation for the Passover feast.

2*d.* Vers. 12–15.‡ *The Preparations.*—It was absolutely impossible to find sufficient food in this place for such a multitude ; and Jesus feels Himself to some extent responsible for the circumstances. This miracle was not, therefore, as Keim maintains, a purely ostentatious prodigy. But in order to understand it thoroughly, it must

* Winer, "Realwörterbuch."

† Konrad Furrer, in the work cited, p. 24, maintains that John (in his view, the romancing Pseudo-John of the second century) places the multiplication of the loaves very much more to the south, opposite Tiberias. The proof of this assertion ? John 6 : 23 : "Howbeit there came other boats from Tiberias nigh unto the place where they did eat bread." It appears, according to M. Furrer, that a large lake can only be traversed in the direction of its width and through the middle of it ! Pray, why could not boats, setting out from Tiberias, visit Bethsaïda-Julias, where it was understood that a great multitude had gone ? Comp. the account which Josephus gives of the transport of a body of troops from Tarichese, at the southern extremity of the lake, to Julias, and of the transport of Josephus, wounded, from Julias to Tarichese (Jos. Vita, § 72). Keim himself says : "The multitude, in order to rejoin Jesus, must have made a journey of six leagues round the lake" (on the hypothesis of Furrer) ; and how could Jesus say to His disciples, when He sent them away to the other side, after the multiplication of the loaves, that He should very soon join them (John 6 : 17 ; Matt. 14 : 22 ; Mark 6 : 45) ? It is on such grounds (*auf topographische Beweise gestützt*) that the evangelist John is made out to be an artist and romancer !

‡ Ver. 12. ℵ. A. B. C. D. L. R. Z., πορευθεντες instead of απελθοντες. Ver. 14. ℵ. L. Ital. Vg., δε instead of γαρ. ℵ. B. C. D. L. R. Z., ωσει ανα instead of ανα.

be looked at from the point of view presented by John. In the Syn. it is the disciples who, as evening draws near, call the attention of Jesus to the situation of the people ; He answers them by inviting them to provide for the wants of the multitude themselves. In John it is Jesus who takes the initiative, addressing Himself specially to Philip ; then He confers with Andrew, who has succeeded in discovering a young lad furnished with some provisions. It is not difficult to reconcile these two accounts ; but in the first we recognize the blurred lines of tradition, in the second the recollections of an eye-witness full of freshness and accuracy. The two hundred pennyworth of bread forms a remarkable mark of agreement between the narrative of John and that of Mark. John does not depend on Mark ; his narrative is distinguished by too many marks of originality. Neither has Mark copied from John ; he would not have effaced the strongly marked features of the narrative of the latter. From this coincidence in such a very insignificant detail we obtain a remarkable confirmation of all those little characteristics by which Mark's narrative is so often distinguished, and which De Wette, Bleek, and others regard as amplifications.

Jesus has no sooner ascertained that there are five loaves and two fishes than He is satisfied. He commands them to make the multitude sit down. Just as though He had said : I have what I want ; the meal is ready ; let them be seated ! But He takes care that this banquet shall be conducted with an order worthy of the God who gives it. Everything must be calm and solemn ; it is a kind of passover meal. By the help of the apostles, He seats His guests in rows of fifty each (Matthew), or in double rows of fifty, by hundreds (Mark). This orderly arrangement allowed of the guests being easily counted. Mark describes in a dramatic manner the striking spectacle presented by these regularly-formed companies, each consisting of two equal ranks, and all arranged upon the slope of the hill (*συμπόσια συμπόσια, πρασιαὶ πρασιαί*, ver. 39, 40). The pastures at that time were in all their spring splendor, and John and Mark offer a fresh coincidence here, in that they both bring forward the beauty of this natural carpet (*χόρτος πολύς*, John ; *χλωρὸς χόρτος*, Mark ; Matthew says, *οἱ χόρτοι*). In conformity with oriental usage, according to which women and children must keep themselves apart, the men alone (*οἱ ἄνδρες*, John 5 : 10) appear to be seated in the order indicated. This explains why, according to the Syn., they alone were counted, as Luke says (ver. 14), also Mark (ver. 44), and, more emphatically still, Matthew (ver. 21, "without women and children").

3*d*. Vers. 16, 17 * *The Repast*.—The pronouncing of a blessing by Jesus is an incident preserved in all four narratives. It must have produced a special impression on all the four witnesses. Each felt that this act contained the secret of the marvellous power displayed on this occasion. To bless God for a little is the way to obtain much. In Matthew and Mark, *εὐλόγησε*, He *blessed*, is absolute : the object understood is God. Luke adds *αὐτούς*, *them* (the food), a word which the Sinaïticus erases (wrongly, it is clear), in accordance with the two other Syn. It is a kind of sacramental consecration. John uses the word *εὐχαριστεῖν*, which is chosen, perhaps, not without reference to the name of the later paschal feast (eucharist). The imperfect *ἐδίδου* in Luke and Mark is graphic : "He gave, and kept on giving." The mention of the fragments indicates the complete satisfaction of their hunger. In John it is Jesus who orders them to be gathered up. This act must therefore be regarded as an expression of filial respect for the gift of the Father. The twelve baskets are men-

* Ver. 16. ℵ. X. Syr^{sch}. omit *αυτους*.

tioned in all the four narratives. The baskets belonged to the furniture of a caravan. Probably they were what the apostles had provided themselves with when they set out. The number of the persons fed is given by Matthew and Mark here. Luke had mentioned it already in the 14th verse, after the reply of the disciples; John a little later (ver. 10), at the moment when the companies were being seated. What unaccountable caprice, if these narratives were taken from each other, or even from the same written source!

The criticism which sets out with the denial of the supernatural is compelled to erase this fact from the history of Jesus; and this miracle cannot, in fact, be explained by the "hidden forces of spontaneity," by the "charm which a person of fine organization exercises over weak nerves." It is not possible either to fall back, with some commentators, on the process of vegetation, by supposing here an unusual acceleration of it; we have to deal with bread, not with corn; with cooked fish, not with living creatures. The fact is miraculous, or it is nothing. M. Rénan has returned to the ancient interpretation of Paulus: Every one took his little store of provisions from his wallet; they lived on very little. Keim combines with this explanation the mythical interpretation in two ways—imitation of the O. T. (the manna; Elisha, 2 Kings 4: 42), and the Christian idea of the multiplication of the Word, the food of the soul. With the explanation of Paulus, it is difficult to conceive what could have excited the enthusiasm of the people to the point of making them instantly resolve to proclaim Jesus as their King! The mythical interpretation has to contend with special difficulties. Four parallel and yet original narratives wonderfully supplementing each other, a number of minute precise details quite incompatible with the nebulous character of a myth (the five loaves and the two fishes, the 5000 persons, the ranks of fifty, and the companies of a hundred, the twelve baskets)—all these details, preserved in four independent and yet harmonious accounts, indicate either a real event or a deliberate invention. But the hypothesis of invention, which Baur so freely applies to the miracles recorded in the fourth Gospel, finds an insurmountable obstacle here in the accounts of the three other evangelists. How is criticism to get out of this network of difficulties? When it has exhausted its ingenuity, it will end by laying down its arms before the holy simplicity of this narrative.

3. *First Announcement of the Passion:* 9: 18-27.—Up to the first multiplication of the loaves, it is impossible to make out any continuous synchronism between the synoptics, as the following table of the series of preceding incidents shows:

MATTHEW.	MARK.	LUKE.
Gadara.	Accusation (Beelzebub).	Parable of the sower.
The Paralytic.		
Call of Matthew.	Mother and brethren of Jesus.	Mother and brethren of Jesus.
Jaïrus.		
The blind and dumb.	Parable of the sower.	
Mission of the Twelve.		
Deputation of John Bapt.	Gadara.	Gadara.
Sabbatic scenes.	Jaïrus.	Jaïrus.
Accusation (Beelzebub).		
Mother and brethren of Jesus.	Nazareth.	
The seven parables.	Mission of the Twelve.	Mission of the Twelve.
Nazareth.		
Murder of John Baptist.	Murder of John Baptist.	
Desert and first multiplication.	Desert and first multiplication.	Desert and first multiplication.

Numbers might be thrown into a bag and taken out again hap-hazard thrice over, without obtaining an order apparently more capricious and varied. Yet of these

three narratives, one is supposed to be copied from the other, or to have emanated from the same written source!

Nevertheless, toward the end a certain parallelism begins to show itself, first of all between Mark and Luke (Gadara, Jaïrus, Mission of the Twelve), then between Matthew and Mark (Nazareth, murder of John, desert and first multiplication) This convergence of the three narratives into one and the same line proceeds from this point, after a considerable omission in Luke, and becomes more decidedly marked, until it reaches Luke 9 : 50, as appears from the following table :

MATTHEW.	MARK.	LUKE.
Desert and first multiplication.	As Matthew.	As Matthew.
Tempest (Peter on the water).	Tempest (without Peter).	Wanting.
Purifying and clean food.	As Matthew.	*Id.*
Canaanitish woman.	*Id.*	*Id.*
Second multiplication.	*Id.*	*Id.*
Sign from heaven (Decapolis).	*Id.*	*Id.*
Leaven of the Pharisees.	*Id.*	*Id.*
First announcement of the Passion.	*Id.*	As Matthew.
Transfiguration.	*Id.*	*Id.*
Lunatic child.	*Id.*	*Id.*
Second announcement of the Passion.	*Id.*	*Id.*
The Didrachma.	Wanting.	Wanting.
The example of the child.	As Matthew.	As Matthew.
Ecclesiastical Discipline.	*Id.*	*Id.*
Wanting.	Intolerance.	As Mark.
Forgiveness of offences.	Wanting.	Wanting.

How is the large omission to be explained which Luke's narrative exhibits from the storm following the first multiplication to the last announcement of the Passion, corresponding to two whole chapters of Matthew (14 · 22–16 : 12) and of Mark (6 : 45–8 : 26)? How is the tolerably exact synchronism which shows itself from this time between all three to be accounted for? Meyer gives up all attempts to explain the omission ; it was due to an unknown chance. Reuss (§ 189) thinks that the copy of Mark which Luke used presented an omission in this place. Bleek attributes the omission to the original Greek Gospel which Matthew and Luke made use of ; Matthew, he supposes, filled it up by means of certain documents, and Mark copied Matthew. Holtzmann (p. 223) contents himself with saying that Luke here breaks the thread of A. (primitive Mark), in order to connect with his narrative the portion which follows ; but he says nothing that might serve to explain this strange procedure. But the hypothesis upon which almost all these attempted solutions rest is that of a common original document, which, however, is continually contradicted by the numerous differences both in form and matter which a single glance of the eye discovers between Matthew and Mark. Then, with all this, the difficulty is only removed a step farther back. For it becomes necessary to explain the omission in the original document. And whenever this is done satisfactorily, it will be found necessary to have recourse to the following idea, which, for our own part, we apply directly to Luke. In the original preaching of the gospel, particular incidents were naturally grouped together in certain cycles more or less fixed, determined sometimes by chronological connection (the call of Matthew, the feast and the subsequent con-

versations, the tempest, Gadara, and Jaïrus), sometimes by the similarity of the subjects (the Sabbatic scenes, 6 : 1–11).* These cycles were first of all put in writing, with considerable freedom and variety, sometimes by the preachers for their own use, and in other cases by their hearers, who were anxious to fix their recollection of them. The oldest writings of which Luke speaks (1 : 1) were probably collections more or less complete of these groups of narratives (*ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν*). And what in this case can be more readily imagined than the omission of one or the other of these cycles in any of these collections? An accident of this kind is sufficient to explain the great omission which we meet with in Luke. The cycle wanting in the document he used extended a little farther than the second multiplication of the loaves, while the following portions belong to a part of the Galilean ministry, which, from the beginning, had taken a more definite form in the preaching. This was natural; for the facts of which this subsequent series is composed are closely connected by a double tie, both chronological and moral. The subject is the approaching sufferings of Jesus. The announcement of them to the disciples is the aim of the following discourse; and to strengthen their faith in view of this overwhelming thought is evidently the design of the transfiguration. The cure of the lunatic child, which took place at the foot of the mountain, was associated with the transfiguration in the tradition; the second announcement of the Passion naturally followed the first, and all the more since it took place during the return from Cæsarea to Capernaum; which was the case also with certain manifestations of pride and intolerance of which the apostles were then guilty, and the account of which terminates this part. In the tradition, this natural cycle formed the close of the Galilean ministry. And this explains how the series of facts has been preserved in almost identical order in the three narratives.

The following conversation, reported also by Matthew (16 : 13 *et seq.*) and Mark (8 : 27 *et seq.*), refers to three points; 1*st*. The Christ (vers. 18–20); 2*d*. The suffering Christ (vers. 21 and 22); 3*d*. The disciples of the suffering Christ (vers. 23–27).

Jesus lost no time in returning to His project of seeking a season of retirement, a project which had been twice defeated, at Bethsaïda-Julias, by the eagerness of the multitude to follow Him, and again in Tyre and Sidon, where, notwithstanding His desire to *remain hid* (Mark 7 : 24), His presence had been discovered by the Canaanitish woman, and afterward noised abroad through the miracle which took place. After that He had returned to the south, had visited a second time that Decapolis which he had previously been obliged to quit almost as soon as He entered it. Then He set out again for the north, this time directing His steps more eastward, toward the secluded valleys where the Jordan rises at the foot of Hermon. The city of Cæsarea Philippi was situated there, inhabited by a people of whom the greater part were heathen (Josephus, Vita, § 13). Jesus might expect to find in this secluded country the solitude which He had sought in vain in other parts of the Holy Land. He did not visit the city itself, but remained in the *hamlets* which surround it (Mark), or generally *in those quarters* (Matthew).

1*st*. Vers. 18–20. *The Christ*.—According to Mark, the following conversation took place during the journey (*ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ*); Mark thus gives precision to the vaguer indication of Matthew. The name of Cæsarea Philippi is wanting in Luke's narra-

* For the working out of a similar idea, see Lachmann's fine work, 'Stud. u. Kritiken,' 1835.

ave. Will criticism succeed in finding a dogmatic motive for this omission? In a writer like Luke, who loves to be precise about places (ver. 10) and times (ver. 28), this omission can only be accounted for by ignorance; therefore he possessed neither Mark nor Matthew, nor the documents from which these last derived this name. The description of the moral situation belongs, however, to Luke: Jesus had just been alone praying. "Arbitrary and ill-chosen scenery," says Holtzmann (p. 224). One would like to know the grounds of this judgment on the part of the German critic. Would not Jesus, at the moment of disclosing to His disciples for the first time the alarming prospect of His approaching death, foreseeing the impression which this communication would make upon them, having regard also the manner in which He must speak to them under such circumstances, be likely to prepare Himself for this important step by prayer? Besides, it is probable that the disciples took part in His prayer. The imperfect *συνῆσαν*, *they were gathered together with Him*, appears to indicate as much. And the term *καταμόνας* (*ὁδούς* understood), *in solitude*, in no way excludes the presence of the disciples, but simply that of the people. This appears from the antithesis, ver. 23: "And He said to them all," and especially from Mark ver. 34: "Having called the multitude." The expression, *they were gathered together*, indicates something of importance. Jesus first of all elicits from His disciples the different opinions which they had gathered from the lips of the people during their mission. The object of this first question is evidently to prepare the way for the next (ver. 20). On the opinions here enumerated, see ver. 8 and John 1 : 21. They amount to this: Men generally regard thee as one of the forerunners of the Messiah. The question addressed to the disciples is designed, first of all, to make them distinctly conscious of the wide difference between the popular opinion and the conviction at which they have themselves arrived; next, to serve as a starting-point for the fresh communication which Jesus is about to make respecting the manner in which the work of the Christ is to be accomplished. The confession of Peter is differently expressed in the three narratives: *the Christ, the Son of the living God* (Matthew); *the Christ* (Mark); *the Christ of God* (Luke). The form in Luke holds a middle place between the other two. The genit., *of God*, signifies, as in the expression *Lamb of God*, He who belongs to God, and whom God sends.

It has been inferred from this question, that up to this time Jesus had not assumed His position as the Messiah among His disciples, and that His determination to accept this character dates from this point; that this resolution was taken partly in concession to the popular idea, which required that His work of restoration should assume this form, and partly to meet the expectation of the disciples, which found emphatic expression through the lips of Peter, the most impatient of their number. But, 1. The question in ver. 20 has not the character of a concession; on the contrary, Jesus thereby takes the initiative in the confession which it calls forth. 2. If this view be maintained, all those previous sayings and incidents in which Jesus gives Himself out to be the Christ must be set aside as unauthentic; and there are such not only in John (1 : 39–41, 49–51; 3 : 14, 4 : 26), but in the Syn. (the election of the Twelve as heads of a new Israel; the parallel which Jesus institutes, Matt. 5, between Himself and the lawgiver of Sinai: "You have heard that it hath been said . . . but I . . .;" the title of bridegroom which He gives Himself, Luke 5 : 30, and parallels). The resolution of Jesus to assume the character of the Messiah, and to accomplish under this national form His universal task as Saviour of the world, was certainly matured within His soul from the first day of His public activity. The scenes of the baptism and temptation forbid any other supposition; hence the entire absence of anything like feeling His way in the progress of His ministry. The import of His question is therefore something very different. The

time had come for Him to pass, if we may so express it, to a new chapter in His teaching. He had hitherto, especially since He began to teach in parables, directed the attention of His disciples to the near approach of the kingdom of God. It was now necessary to turn it toward Himself as Head of this kingdom, and especially toward the future, wholly unlooked for by them, which awaited Him in this character. They knew that He was the Christ; they had yet to learn how He was to be it. But before commencing on this new ground, He is anxious that they should express in a distinct declaration, the result of His instructions and of their own previous experiences. As an experienced teacher, before beginning the new lesson He makes them recapitulate the old. With the different forms and vacillations of opinion, as well as the open denials of the rulers before them. He wants to hear from their own lips the expression of their own warm and decided conviction. This established result of His previous labor will serve as a foundation for the new labor which the gravity of His situation urges Him to undertake. The murder of John the Baptist made Him sensible that His own end was not far off; the time, therefore, was come to substitute for the brilliant form of the Christ, which as yet filled the minds of His disciples, the mournful image of the Man of sorrows. Thus the facts which, as we have seen (p. 257), led Jesus to seek retirement in the desert of Bethsaïda-Julias, that He might be alone with His disciples, furnished the motives for the present conversation.

We read in John, after the multiplication of the loaves (chap. 6), of a similar confession to this, also made by Peter in the name of the Twelve. Is it to be supposed, that at the same epoch two such similar declarations should have taken place? Would Jesus have called for one so soon after having heard the other? Is it not striking that, owing to the omission in Luke, the account of this confession, in his narrative as in John's follows immediately upon that of the multiplication of the loaves? Certainly the situation described in the fourth Gospel is very different. In consequence of a falling away which had just been going on among His Galilean disciples, Jesus puts the question to His apostles of their leaving Him. But the questions which Jesus addresses to them in the Syn. might easily have found a place in the conversation of which John gives us a mere outline. At the first glance, it is true, John's narrative does not lead us to suppose such a long interval between the multiplication of the loaves and this conversation as is required for the journey from Capernaum to Cæsarea Philippi. But the desertion of the Galilean disciples, which had begun immediately, was not completed in a day. It might have extended over some time (John 6 : 66 : ἐκ τούτου, *from that time*). Altogether the resemblance between these two scenes appears to us to outweigh their dissimilarity.

Keim admirably says: "We do not know which we must think the greatest; whether the spirit of the disciples, who shatter the Messianic mould, set aside the judgment of the priests, rise above all the intervening degrees of popular appreciation, and proclaim as lofty and divine that which is abased and downtrodden, because to their minds' eye it is and remains great and divine—or this personality of Jesus, which draws from these feeble disciples, notwithstanding the pressure of the most overwhelming experiences, so pure and lofty an expression of the effect produced upon them by His whole life and ministry." Gess: "The sages of Capernaum remained unmoved, the enthusiasm of the people was cooled, on every side Jesus was threatened with the fate of the Baptist . . . it was then that the faith of His disciples shone out as genuine, and came forth from the furnace of trial as an energetic conviction of truth."

2*d.* Vers. 21, 22.* *The Suffering Christ.*—The expression of Luke," He straitly charged and commanded them," is very energetic. The general reason for this prohibition is found in the following announcement of the rejection of the Messiah, as is proved by the participle εἰπών, *saying*. They were to keep from proclaiming Him openly as the Christ, on account of the contradiction between the hopes which this title had awakened in the minds of the people, and the way in which this office was

* The MSS. vary between ειπειν (T. R.) and λεγειν (Alex.). Ver. 22. The MSS. vary between εγερθηναι (T. R.) and αναστηναι.

to be realized in Him. But this threatening prohibition had a more special nature, which appears from John's narrative. It refers to the recent attempt of the people, after the multiplication of the loaves (John 6 : 14, 15), to proclaim Him king, and the efforts which Jesus was then obliged to make to preserve His disciples from this mistaken enthusiasm, which might have seriously compromised His work. It is the recollection of this critical moment which induces Jesus to use this severe language (ἐπιτιμήσας). It was only after the idol of the carnal Christ had been forever nailed to the cross, that the apostolic preaching could safely connect this title Christ with the name of Jesus. "See how," as Riggenbach says ("Vie de Jésus," p. 318), "Jesus was obliged in the very moment of self-revelation to veil Himself, when He had lighted the fire to cover it again." Δέ (ver. 21) is adversative : "Thou sayest truly, I am the Christ ; *but* . . ." *Must,* on account of the prophecies and of the Divine purpose, of which they are the expression. The members composing the Sanhedrim consisted of three classes of members : the elders, or presidents of synagogues ; the high priests, the heads of twenty-four classes of priests ; and scribes, or men learned in the law. All three Syn. give here the enumeration of these official classes. This paraphrase of the technical name invests the announcement of the rejection with all its importance. What a complete reversal of the disciples' Messianic ideas was this rejection of Jesus by the very authorities from whom they expected the recognition and proclamation of the Messiah ! Ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι indicates deliberate rejection, after previous calculation. There was a crushing contradiction between this prospect and the hopes of the disciples ; but, as Klostermann truly says, the last words, "And He shall rise again the third day," furnish the solution of it.

Strauss and Baur contented themselves with denying the details of the prediction in which Jesus foretold His death. Volkmar and Holsten at the present day refuse to allow that He had any knowledge of this event before the last moments. According to Holsten, He went to Jerusalem full of hope, designing to preach there as well as in Galilee, and confident, in case of need, of the interposition of God and of the swords of His adherents. . . . The holy Supper itself was occasioned simply by a passing presentiment. . . . His terrible mistake took Jesus by surprise at the last moment. Keim (ii. p. 556) acknowledges that it is impossible to deny the authenticity of the scene and conversation at Cæsarea Philippi. According to him, Jesus could not have failed to have foreseen His violent death long before the catastrophe came. This is proved by the bold opposition of St. Peter, also by such sayings as those referring to the bridegroom who is to be taken away, to death as the way of life (Luke 9 : 23, 24), to Jerusalem which kills the prophets ; lastly, by the reply to the two sons of Zebedee. We may add 9 : 31, 12 : 50 ; John 2 : 20, 3 : 14, 6 : 53, 12 : 7. 24—words at once characteristic and inimitable. And as to the details of this prediction, have we not a number of facts which leave no room for doubt as to the supernatural knowledge of Jesus (22 : 10–34 ; John 1 : 49, 4 : 18, 6 : 64, etc.)? What the modern critics more generally dispute, is the announcement of the resurrection. But if Jesus foresaw His death, He must have equally foreseen His resurrection, as certainly as a prophet believing in the mission of Israel could not announce the captivity without also predicting the return. And who would ever have dreamed of putting into the mouth of Jesus the expression three days and three nights after the event, when in actual fact the time spent in the tomb did not exceed one day and two nights? It is asked how it came to pass if Jesus, had so expressly predicted His resurrection, that this event should have been such an extraordinary surprise to his apostles? There we have a psychological problem, which the disciples themselves found it difficult to explain. Comp. the remarks of the evangelists, 5 : 45, 18 : 34, and parallels, which can only have come from the apostles. The explanation of this problem is perhaps this : the apostles never thought, before the facts had opened their eyes, that the expressions death and resurrection used by Jesus should be taken

literally. Their Master so commonly spoke in figurative language that up to the last moment they only saw in the first term the expression of a sad separation, a sudden disappearance ; and in the second, only a sudden return, a glorious reappearing. And even after the death of Jesus, they in no way thought they should see Him appear again in His old form, and by the restoration to life of the body laid in the tomb. If they expected anything, it was His return as a heavenly king (see on 23 : 42). Luke has omitted here the word of approval and the severe reprimand which Jesus, according to Matthew, addressed to Peter on this occasion. If any one is determined to see in this omission of Luke's a wilful suppression, the result of ill-will toward the Apostle Peter, or at least toward the Jewish Christians (Keim), what will he say of Mark, who, while omitting the words of praise, expressly refers to those of censure ?

We can quite understand that the people could not yet bear the disclosure of a suffering Messiah ; but Jesus might make them participate in it indirectly, by initiating them into the practical consequences of this fact for His true disciples. To describe the moral crucifixion of His servants vers. 23–27, was to give a complete revelation of the spirituality of the Messianic kingdom.

3d. Vers. 23–27.* " And He said to them all, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me. 24. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it ; but whosoever will lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it. 25. For what is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world, and lose himself, or be cast away ? 26. For whosoever shall be ashamed of me, and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when He shall come in His own glory, and in His Father's and of the holy angels. 27 But I tell you of a truth, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God." The preceding conversation had taken place within the privacy of the apostolic circle (ver. 18). The following words are addressed to all, that is to say, to the multitude, which, while Jesus was praying with His disciples, kept at a distance. According to Mark, Jesus calls them to Him to hear the instruction which follows. Holtzmann maintains that this to all of Luke must have been taken from Mark. But why could not the same remark, if it resulted from an actual fact, be reproduced in two different forms, in two independent documents ? Jesus here represents all those who attach themselves to Him under the figure of a train of crucified persons, ver. 23. The aor. ἐλθεῖν of the T. R. means : make in general part of my following ; and the present ἐρχεσθαι in the Alex. : range themselves about me at this very moment. The figure employed is that of a journey, which agrees with their actual circumstances as described by Mark : ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ. The man who has made up his mind to set out on a journey, has first of all to say farewell ; here he has to bid adieu to his own life, to deny himself. Next there is luggage to carry ; in this case it is *the cross*, the sufferings and reproach which never fail to fall on him who pays a serious regard to holiness of life. By the word *αἴρειν, to take up*, to burden one's self with, Jesus alludes to the custom of making criminals carry their cross to the place of punishment. Further, there is in this term the idea of a voluntary and cheerful acceptance. Jesus says *his* cross, that which is the result of a person's own character and providential position. There is nothing arbitrary about it ; it is given from

* Ver. 23. The MSS. vary between ελθειν (T. R., Byz.) and ερχεσθαι (Alex.). ℵ^{ca}. C. D. and 11 Mjj. 120 Mnn. It^{plerique}, omit καθ' ημεραν, which is the reading of T. R. with ℵ* A. B. K. L. M. R. Z. Π. Syr. Vg. Ver. 26. D. Syr^{cur}. It$^{aliq.}$ omit λογους. Ver. 27. ℵ. B, L, X., αυτου instead of ωδε. 13 Mjj., οιτινες instead of οι.

above. The authenticity of the word *daily*, which is wanting in some MSS., cannot be doubted. Had it been a gloss, it would have been inserted in Matthew and Mark as well. This voluntary crucifixion is carried on every day to a certain degree. Lastly, after having taken farewell and shouldered his burden, he must set out on his journey. By what road? By that which the steps of his Master have marked out. The chart of the true disciple directs him to renounce every path of his own choosing, that he may put his feet into the print of his leader's footsteps. Thus, and not by arbitrary mortifications actuated by self-will, is the death of self completely accomplished. The term *follow*, therefore, does not express the same idea as *come after me*, at the beginning of the verse; the latter would denote *outward* adherence to the followers of Jesus. The other refers to practical fidelity in the fulfilment of the consequences of this engagement.

The 24th verse demonstrates (*for*) the necessity for the crucifixion described, ver. 23. Without this death to self, man loses himself (24*a*); while by this sacrifice he saves himself (24*b*). We find here the paradoxical form in which the Hebrew *Maschal* loves to clothe itself. Either of the two ways brings the just man to the antipodes of the point to which it seemed likely to lead him. This profound saying, true even for man in his innocence, is doubly true when applied to man as a sinner. Ψυχή, *the breath of life*, denotes the soul, with its entire system of instincts and natural faculties. This psychical life is unquestionably good, but only as a point of departure, and as a means of acquiring a higher life. To be anxious to *save* it, to seek to preserve it as it is, by doing nothing but care for it, and seek the utmost amount of self-gratification, is a sure way of losing it forever; for it is wanting to give stability to what in its essence is but transitory, and to change a means into an end. Even in the most favorable case, the natural life is only a transient flower, which must soon fade. That it may be preserved from dissolution, we must consent to *lose* it, by surrendering it to the mortifying and regenerating breath of the Divine Spirit, who transforms it into a higher life, and imparts to it an eternal value. To keep it, therefore, is to lose both it and the higher life into which, as the blossom into its fruit, it should have been transformed. To lose it is to gain it, first of all, under the higher form of spiritual life; then, some day, under the form even of natural life, with all its legitimate instincts fully satisfied. Jesus says, "for *my sake*;" and in Mark, "for my sake *and the Gospel's*." It is, in fact, only as we give ourselves to Christ that we satisfy this profound law of human existence; and it is only by the gospel, received in faith, that we can contract this personal relationship to Christ. *Self* perishes only when affixed to the cross of Jesus, and the divine breath, which imparts the new life to man, comes to him from Christ alone. No axiom was more frequently repeated by Jesus; it is, as it were, the substance of his moral philosophy. In Luke 17 : 33 it is applied to the time of the Parousia; it is then, in fact, that it will be fully realized. In John 12 : 25 Jesus makes it the law of his own existence; in Matt. 10 : 39 he applies it to the apostolate.

Vers. 25–27 are the confirmation (*for*) of this *Maschal*, and first of all, vers. 25 and 26, of the first proposition. Jesus supposes, ver. 25, the act of *saving one's own life*, accomplished with the most complete success . . . amounting to a gain of the whole world. But in this very moment the master of this magnificent domain finds himself condemned to perish! What gain! To draw in a lottery a gallery of pictures . . . and at the same time to become blind! The expression ἢ ζημιωθείς, *or suffering loss*, is difficult. In Matthew and Mark this word, completed by ψυχήν,

corresponds to ἀπολέσας in Luke; but in Luke it must express a different idea. We may understand with it either *the world* or ἑαυτόν, *himself*, "suffering the loss of this world already gained," or (which is more natural) "losing himself altogether (ἀπολέσας), or even merely suffering some small loss in his own person." It is not necessary that the chastisement should amount to total perdition; the smallest injury to the human personality will be found to be a greater evil than all the advantages accruing from the possession of the whole world.

The losing one's self [the loss of the personality] mentioned in ver. 25 consists, according to ver, 26 (*for*), in being denied by Jesus in the day of his glory. The expression, *to be ashamed of Jesus*, might be applied to the Jews, because fear of their rulers hindered them from declaring themselves for him; but in this context it is more natural to apply it to disciples whose fidelity gives way before ridicule or violence. The *Cantabrigiensis* omits the word λόγους, which leads to the sense: "ashamed of me *and mine*." This reading would recommend itself if better supported, and if the word λόγους (*my words*) was not confirmed by the parallel expression of Mark (8 : 35): "for my sake *and the gospel's*." The glory of the royal advent of Jesus will be, first, that of his own personal appearing; next, the glory of God; lastly, the glory of the angels—all these several glories will be mingled together in the incomparable splendor of that great day (2 Thess. 1 : 7–10). "Thus," says Gess, "to be worthy of this man is the new and paramount principle. This is no mere spiritualization of the Mosaic law; it is a revolution in the religious and moral intuitions of mankind."

Ver. 27 is the justification of the promise in ver. 24*b* (find his life by losing it), as vers. 25 and 26 explained the threatening of 24*a*. It forms in the three Syn. the conclusion of this discourse, and the transition to the narrative of the transfiguration; but could any of the evangelists have applied to such an exceptional and transitory incident this expression: *the coming of the kingdom of Christ* (Matthew), or *of God* (Mark and Luke)? Meyer thinks that this saying can only apply to the Parousia, to which the preceding verse referred, and which was believed to be very near. But could Jesus have labored under this misconception (see the refutation of this opinion at chap. 21)? Or has the meaning of his words been altered by tradition? The latter view only would be tenable. Many, urging the difference between Matthew's expression (until they have seen *the Son of man coming in His kingdom*) and that of Mark ("... *the kingdom of God come with power*") or of Luke ("... *the kingdom of God*") think that the notion of the Parousia has been designedly erased from the text of Matthew by the other two, because they wrote after the fall of Jerusalem. Comp. also the relation between Matt. 24, where the confusion of the two events appears evident, and Luke 21, where it is avoided. But, 1. It is to be observed that this confusion is found in Mark (13) exactly the same as in Matthew (24). Now, if Mark had corrected Matthew for the reason alleged in the passage *before us*, how much more would he have corrected him in chap. 13, where it is not a single isolated passage that is in question, but where the subject of the Parousia is the chief matter of discourse! And if the form of expression in Mark is not the result of an intentional correction, but of a simple difference in the mode of transmission, why might it not be the same also with the very similar form that occurs in Luke? 2. There is a very marked distinction both in Mark and Luke, a sort of gradation and antithesis between this saying and the preceding—in Luke by means of the particle δέ, *and further*: "And I *also* say that this recompense promised

to the faithful confessors shall be enjoyed by some of you before you die ;" and in Mark, in a still more striking manner, by the interruption of the discourse and the commencement of a new phrase : "*And He said to them*" (9 : 1). So that the idea of the Parousia must be set aside as far as the texts of Mark and Luke are concerned. It may even be doubted whether it is contained in Matthew's expression ; comp. Matt. 26 : 64 : "*Henceforth* [from now] ye shall see the Son of man *coming* in the clouds of heaven." The expression *henceforth* does not permit of our thinking of the Parousia. But this saying is very similar to the one before us. Others apply this promise to the fall of Jerusalem, or to the establishment of the kingdom of God among the heathen, or to the descent of the Holy Spirit. But inasmuch as these events were outward facts, and *all* who were contemporary with them were witnesses of them, we cannot by this reference explain τινές, *some*, which announces an exceptional privilege. After all, is the Lord's meaning so difficult to apprehend? *Seeing the kingdom of God*, in his teaching, is a spiritual fact, in accordance with the inward nature of the kingdom itself ; comp. 17 : 21 : "The kingdom of God is *within you*" (see the explanation of this passage). For this reason, in order to enjoy this sight, a new sense, and a new birth are needed ; John 3 : 3 : "Except a man be *born again*, he cannot *see* the kingdom of God. This thought satisfactorily explains the present promise as expressed in Luke and Mark. To explain Matthew's expression, we must remember that the work of the Holy Spirit pre-eminently consists in giving us a lively conviction of the exaltation and heavenly glory of Jesus (John 16 : 14). The τινές, *some*, are therefore all those then present who should receive the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, and behold with their inward eye those *wonderful works of God*, which Jesus calls his kingdom, or the kingdom of God. In this way is explained the gradation from ver. 26 to ver. 27 in Mark and Luke : "Whoever shall give his own life shall find it again, not only at the end of time, but even in this life (at Pentecost)." If this explanation be inadmissible, it must be conceded that this promise is based on a confusion of the fall of Jerusalem with the Parousia ; and this would be a proof that our Gospel as well as Matthew's was written before that catastrophe. Ἀληθῶς must not be connected with λέγω : *Verily I say to you.* It should be placed before the verb, as the ἀμήν is in the two other Syn. ; and Luke more generally makes use of ἐπ' ἀληθείας (three times in the Gospel, twice in the Acts). It must, then, belong to εἰσίν : "*There are certainly among you.*" The Alex. reading αὐτοῦ, *here*, must be preferred to the received reading, ὧδε, which is taken from the other Syn.

4. *The Transfiguration :* 9 : 28–36.—There is but one allusion to this event in the whole of the N. T. (2 Peter 1), which proves that it has no immediate connection with the work of salvation. On the other hand, its historical reality can only be satisfactorily established in so far as we succeed in showing in a reasonable way its place in the course of the life and development of Jesus.* According to the description of the transfiguration given in the Syn. (Matt. 17 : 1, *et seq.* ; Mark 9 : 2, *et seq.*), we distinguish three phases in this scene : 1*st.* The personal glorification of Jesus (vers. 28, 29) ; 2*d.* The appearing of Moses and Elijah, and His conversation with them (vers. 30–33) ; 3*d.* The interposition of God Himself (vers. 34–36).

* No one seems to us to have apprehended the real and profound meaning of the transfiguration so well as Lange, in his admirable "Vie de Jésus," a book the defects of which have unfortunately been much more noticed than its rare beauties. Keim might have learned more from him, especially in the study of this incident.

1*st.* Vers. 28, 29.* *The Glory of Jesus.*—The three narratives show that there was an interval of a week between the transfiguration and the first announcement of the sufferings of Jesus, with this slight difference, that Matthew and Mark say *six days after*, while Luke says *about eight days after*. It is a very simple explanation to suppose that Luke employs a round number, as indeed the limitation ὡσεί, *about*, indicates, while the others give, from some document, the exact figure. But this explanation is too simple for criticism. "Luke," says Holtzmann, "affects to be a better chronologist than the others." And for this reason, forsooth, he substitutes *eight* for *six* on his own authority, and immediately, from some qualm of conscience, corrects himself by using the word *about!* To such puerilities is criticism driven by the hypothesis of a common document. The Aramæan constructions, which characterize the style of Luke in this passage, and which are not found in the two other Syn. (ἐγένετο καὶ ἀνέβη, ver. 28; ἐγένετο εἶπεν, ver. 33), would be sufficient to prove that he follows a different document from theirs. The nominative ἡμέραι ὀκτώ, *eight days*, is the subject of an elliptical phrase which forms a parenthesis: "About eight days had passed away." It is not without design that Luke expressly adds, *after these sayings*. He thereby brings out the moral connection between this event and the preceding conversation. We might think, from the account of Matthew and Mark, that in taking His disciples to the mountain, Jesus intended to be transfigured before them. Luke gives us to understand that He simply wished to pray with them. Lange thinks, and it is probable, that in consequence of the announcement of His approaching sufferings, deep depression had taken possession of the hearts of the Twelve. They had spent these six days, respecting which the sacred records preserve unbroken silence, in a gloomy stupor. Jesus was anxious to rouse them out of a feeling which, to say the least, was quite as dangerous as the enthusiastic excitement which had followed the multiplication of the loaves. And in order to do this He had recourse to prayer; He sought to strengthen by this means those apostles especially whose moral state would determine the disposition of their colleagues. Knowing well by experience the influence a sojourn upon some height has upon the soul—how much more easily in such a place it collects its thoughts and recovers from depression—He leads them away to a mountain. The art. τό denotes the mountain nearest to the level country where Jesus then was. According to a tradition, of which we can gather no positive traces earlier than the fourth century (Cyril of Jerusalem, Jerome), the mountain in question was Tabor, a lofty cone, situated two leagues to the south-east of Nazareth. Perhaps the Gospel to the Hebrews presents an older trace of this opinion in the words which it attributes to Jesus: "Then my mother, the Holy Spirit, took me up by a hair of my head, and carried me to the high mountain of Tabor." But two circumstances are against the truth of this tradition: 1. Tabor is a long way off Cæsarea Philippi, where the previous conversation took place. Certainly, in the intervening six days Jesus could have returned even to the neighborhood of Tabor. But would not Matthew and Mark, who have noticed the journey into the northern country, have mentioned this return? 2. The summit of Tabor was at that time, as Robinson has proved, occupied by a fortified town, which would scarcely agree with the tranquillity which Jesus sought. We think, therefore, that probably the choice lies between Hermon and Mount Panias, from

* Ver. 28. ℵ* B. II. Syr. It^{aliq}. omit καὶ before παραλαβων. The mss. vary between Ιωαννην καὶ Ιακωβον and Ιακωβον καὶ Ιωαννην.

whose snowy summits, visible to the admiring eye in all the northern parts of the Holy Land, the sources of the Jordan are constantly fed.

The strengthening of the faith of the three principal apostles was the object, therefore, of this mountain excursion ; the glorification of Jesus was an answer to prayer, and the means employed by God to bring about the desired result. The connection between the prayer of Jesus and His transfiguration is expressed in Luke by the preposition ἐν, which denotes more than a mere simultaneousness (while He prayed), and makes His prayer the cause of this mysterious event. Elevated feeling imparts to the countenance and even to the figure of the entire man a distinguished appearance. The impulse of true devotion, the enthusiasm of adoration, illumine him. And when, corresponding with this state of soul, there is a positive revelation on the part of God, as in the case of Moses or of Stephen, then, indeed, it may come to pass that the inward illumination, penetrating, through the medium of the soul, even to its external covering, the body, may produce in it a prelude, as it were, of its future glorification. It was some phenomenon of this kind that was produced in the person of Jesus while He was praying. Luke describes its effects in the simplest manner : "His countenance became other." How can Holtzmann maintain that in him the vision is "æsthetically amplified." His expression is much more simple than Mark's : "He was transfigured before them," or than that of Matthew, who to these words of Mark adds, "and his countenance shone as the sun." This luminous appearance possessed the body of Jesus in such intensity as to become perceptible even through His garments. Even here the expression of Luke is very simple : "His garments became white and shining," and contrasts with the stronger expressions of Mark and Matthew. The grandeur of the recent miracles shows us that Jesus at this time had reached the zenith of His powers. As everything in His life was in perfect harmony, this period must have been that also in which He reached the perfection of His inward development. Having reached it, what was His normal future? He could not advance ; He must not go back. From this moment, therefore, earthly existence became too narrow a sphere for this perfected personality. There only remained death ; but death is the offspring of the sinner, or, as St. Paul says, *the wages of sin* (Rom. 6 : 23). For the sinless man the issue of life is not the sombre passage of the tomb ; rather is it the royal road of a glorious transformation. Had the hour of this glorification struck for Jesus ; and was His transfiguration the beginning of the heavenly renewal? This is Lange's thought ; it somehow brings this event within the range of the understanding. Gess gives expression to it in these words : "This event indicates the ripe preparation of Jesus for immediate entrance upon eternity." Had not Jesus Himself voluntarily suspended the change which was on the point of being wrought in Him, this moment would have become the moment of His ascension.

2d. Vers. 30–33. *The Appearing of Moses and Elijah.*—Not only do we sometimes see the eye of the dying lighted up with celestial brightness, but we hear him conversing with the dear ones who have gone before him to the heavenly home. Through the gate which is opened for him, heaven and earth hold fellowship. In the same way, at the prayer of Jesus, heaven comes down or earth rises. The two spheres touch. Keim says : "A descent of heavenly spirits to the earth has no warrant either in the ordinary course of events or in the Old or New Testament." Gess very properly replies : "Who can prove that the appearing of these heroes of the Old Covenant was in contradiction to the laws of the upper world? We had far better confess

our ignorance of those laws." Moses and Elijah are there, *talking with Him*. Luke does not name them at first. He says *two men*. This expression reflects the impression which must have been experienced by the eye-witnesses of the scene. They perceived, first of all, the presence of two persons unknown; it was only afterward that they knew them by name. Ἰδού, *behold*, expresses the suddenness of the apparition. The imperf., *they were talking*, proves that the conversation had already lasted some time when the disciples perceived the presence of these strangers. Οἵτινες is emphatic: *who were no other than* . . . Moses and Elijah were the two most zealous and powerful servants of God under the Old Covenant. Moreover, both of them had a privileged end: Elijah, by his ascension, was preserved from the unclothing of death; there was something equally mysterious in the death and disappearance of Moses. Their appearing upon the mountain is perhaps connected with the exceptional character of the end of their earthly life. But how, it is asked, did the apostles know them? Perhaps Jesus addressed them by name in the course of the conversation, or indicated who they were in a way that admitted of no mistake. Or, indeed, is it not rather true that the glorified bear upon their form the impress of their individuality, their new name (Rev. 3:17)? Could we behold St. John or St. Paul in their heavenly glory for any length of time without giving them their name?

The design of this appearing is only explained to us by Luke: "They talked," he says literally, "of the departure which Jesus was about to accomplish at Jerusalem." How could certain theologians imagine that Moses and Elijah came to instruct Jesus respecting His approaching sufferings, when only six days before He had Himself informed the Twelve about them? It is rather the two heavenly messengers who are learning of Jesus, as the apostles were six days before, unless one imagines that they talked with Him on a footing of equality. In view of that cross which is about to be erected, Elijah learns to know a glory superior to that of being taken up to heaven—the glory of renouncing, through love, such an ascension, and choosing rather a painful and ignominious death. Moses comprehends that there is a sublimer end than that of dying, according to the fine expression which the Jewish doctors apply to his death, "from the kiss of the Eternal;" and this is to deliver up one's soul to the fire of divine wrath. This interview, at the same time, gave a sanction, in the minds of the disciples, to an event from the prospect of which only six days before they shrank in terror. The term ἔξοδος, *going out*, employed by Luke, is chosen designedly; for it contains, at the same time, the ideas both of death and ascension. Ascension was as much the natural way for Jesus as death is for us. He might ascend with the two who talked with Him. But to ascend now would be to ascend without us. Down below, on the plain, He sees mankind crushed beneath the weight of sin and death. Shall He abandon them? He cannot bring Himself to this. He cannot ascend unless He carry them with Him; and in order to do this, He now braves the other issue, which He can only accomplish at Jerusalem. Πληροῦν, to *accomplish*, denotes not the finishing of life by dying (Bleek), but the completion of death itself. In such a death there is a task to accomplish. The expression, *at Jerusalem*, has deep tragedy in it; at Jerusalem, that city which has the monopoly of the murder of the prophets (13:33). This single word of Luke's on the subject of the conversation throws light upon the scene, and we can appraise at its true value the judgment of the critics (Meyer, Holtzmann), who regard it as nothing more than the supposition of later tradition?

Further, it is through Luke that we are able to form an idea of the true state of

the disciples during this scene. The imperf., *they talked*, ver. 30, has shown us that the conversation had already lasted some time when the disciples perceived the presence of the two heavenly personages. We must infer from this that they were asleep during the prayer of Jesus. This idea is confirmed by the plus-perfect ἦσαν βεβαρημένοι, *they had been weighed down*, ver. 32. They were in this condition during the former part of the interview, and they only came to themselves just as the conversation was concluding. The term διαγρηγορεῖν is used nowhere else in the N. T. In profane Greek, where it is very little used, it signifies: *to keep awake*. Meyer would give it this meaning here: "persevering in keeping themselves awake, notwithstanding the drowsiness which oppressed them." This sense is not inadmissible; nevertheless, the δέ, *but*, which denotes an opposition to this state of slumber, rather inclines us to think that this verb denotes their return to self-consciousness through (διά) a momentary state of drowsiness. Perhaps we should regard the choice of this unusual term as indicating a strange state, which many persons have experienced, when the soul, after having sunk to sleep in prayer, in coming to itself, no longer finds itself in the midst of earthly things, but feels raised to a higher sphere, in which it receives impressions full of unspeakable joy.

Ver. 33 also enables us to see the true meaning of Peter's words mentioned in the three narratives. It was the moment, Luke tells us, when the two heavenly messengers were preparing to part from the Lord. Peter, wishing to detain them, ventures to speak. He offers to construct a shelter, hoping thereby to induce them to prolong their sojourn here below; as if it were the fear of spending the night in the open air that obliged them to withdraw! This enables us to understand Luke's remark (comp. also Mark): *not knowing what he said*. This characteristic speech was stereotyped in the tradition, with this trifling difference, that in Matthew Peter calls Jesus *Lord* (κύριε), in Mark *Master* (ῥαββί), in Luke *Master* (ἐπιστάτα). And it is imagined that our evangelists amused themselves by making these petty changes in a common text!

3*d*. Vers. 34–36.* *The Divine Voice.*—Here we have the culminating point of this scene. As the last sigh of the dying Christian is received by the Lord, who comes for him (John 14 : 3; Acts 7 : 55, 56), so the presence of God is manifested at the moment of the glorification of Jesus. The cloud is no ordinary cloud; it is the veil in which God invests Himself when He appears here below. We meet with it in the desert and at the inauguration of the temple; we shall meet with it again at the ascension. Matthew calls it a bright cloud; nevertheless, he says, with the two others, that it overshadowed this scene. His meaning is, that the brightness of the central light pierced through the cloudy covering which cast its mysterious shadow on the scene. If with the T. R. we read ἐκείνους, only Jesus, Moses, and Elijah were enveloped in the cloud, and the fear felt by the disciples proceeded from uneasiness at being separated from their Master. But if with the Alex. we read αὐτούς, all six were enveloped in an instant by the cloud, and the fear which seized the apostles was caused by their vivid sense of the divine nearness. The former meaning is more natural; for the voice coming forth out of the cloud could scarcely be addressed to any but persons who were themselves outside the cloud.

* Ver. 34. ℵ. B. L. some Mnn., επεσκιαζεν instead of επεσκιασεν. ℵ. B. C. L. some Mnn., εισελθειν αυτους instead of εκεινους εισελθειν, which is the reading of T. R. with the other Mjj. and the versions. Ver. 35. ℵ. B. L. Z. Cop., ο εκλελεγμενος instead of ο αγαπητος, which is the reading of T. R. with 18 Mjj., the greater part of the Mnn. Syr. It^{aliq}.

The form of the divine declaration is very nearly the same in the three accounts. The Alex. reading in Luke : *this is my Elect*, is preferable to the received reading : *this is my beloved Son*, which is taken either from the two other narratives, or from the divine salutation at the baptism. It is a question here of the elect in an absolute sense, in opposition to servants, like Moses and Elijah, chosen for a special work. Comp. 23 : 35. The exhortation : *Hear Him*, is the repetition of that by which Moses, Deut. 18 . 15, charged Israel to welcome at some future day the teaching of the Messiah. This last word indicates the design of the whole scene : "Hear Him, whatever He may say to you : follow in His path, wherever He may lead you." We have only to call to mind the words of Peter : "Be it far from thee, Lord ! this shall not be unto Thee," in the preceding conversation, to feel the true bearing of this divine admonition. We find here again the realization of a law which occurs throughout the life of Jesus ; it is this, that every act of voluntary humiliation on the part of the Son is met by a corresponding act of glorification, of which He is the object, on the part of the Father. He goes down into the waters of the Jordan, devoting Himself to death ; God addresses Him as His well-beloved Son. In John 12, in the midst of the trouble of His soul, He renews His vow to be faithful unto death ; a voice from heaven answers Him with the most magnificent promise for His filial heart.

Matthew mentions here the feeling of fear which the other two mention earlier. The word : *Jesus only*, ver. 36, is common to the three narratives. It is a forcible expression of the feeling of those who witnessed the scene after the disappearing of the celestial visitants ; see on 2 : 15. Does it contain any allusion to the idea which has been made the very soul of the narrative : The law and the prophets pass away ; Jesus and His word alone remain ? To me it appears doubtful. The silence kept at first by the apostles is accounted for in Matthew and Mark by a positive command of Jesus. The Lord's intention, doubtless, was to prevent the carnal excitement which the account of such a scene might produce in the hearts of the other apostles and in the minds of the people. After the resurrection and the ascension, there would no longer be anything dangerous in the account of the transfiguration. The risen One could not be a king of this world. Luke does not mention Jesus' prohibition ; he had no reason for omitting it, had he known of it. The omission of the following conversation respecting the coming of Elijah may be accounted for, on the other hand, as intentional. This idea being current only among the Jews, Luke might not think it necessary to record for Gentile readers the conversation to which it had given rise. Besides, 1 : 17 already contained a summary of what there was to be said on this subject. This entire scene, then, in each of its phases, conduced to the object which Jesus had in view—the strengthening of the faith of His own. In the first, the contemplation of His glory ; in the second, the sanction of that way of sorrow into which He was to enter and take them with Him ; in the third, the divine approval stamped on all His teaching : these were powerful supports for the faith of the three principal apostles, which, once confirmed, became, apart from words, the support of the faith of their weaker fellow-disciples.

The objections to the reality of the transfiguration are : 1. Its magical character and uselessness : Why, asks Keim, should there be a sign from heaven on this grand scale, when Jesus always refused to grant any such prodigy ! But nowhere, perhaps, does the sound reasonableness of the gospel come out more clearly than in this narrative ; glorification is as much the normal termination of a holy life, as death is

of corrupt life. The design with which this manifestation, which might have been concealed from the disciples, was displayed to them, appears from its connection with the previous conversation respecting the sufferings of the Messiah. 2. The impossibility of the reappearing of beings who have long been dead (see on ver. 30). 3. A real appearing of Elijah would be an actual contradiction to the following conversation (in Matthew and Mark), in which Jesus denies the return of this prophet in person, as expected by the rabbis and the people. These are the arguments of Bleek and Keim. But what Jesus denies in the following conversation is not a temporary appearance, like that of the transfiguration, but Elijah's return to life on earth in order to fulfil a new ministry. This is what John the Baptist had accomplished (1 : 17). 4 The silence of John, who must have conceived of the glory of Jesus in a more spiritual manner. Is it to be believed that this objection can be raised by the same critic who blames John for the magical character of the miracles which he relates, and denies their reality for this reason? The transfiguration, along with many other incidents (the choice of the Twelve, the institution of baptism and the Lord's Supper, etc.), is omitted by John for the simple reason that they were sufficiently known through the Syn., and did not necessarily enter into the plan of his book. 5. "The artificial character of the narrative appears from its resemblance to certain narratives of the O. T." (Keim). And yet this very Keim disputes the reality of the appearing of Moses and Elijah, on the ground that apparitions of the dead are not warranted by the O. T.! But how is the existence of our three narratives to be explained? Paulus reduces the whole to a natural incident. He supposes an interview of Jesus with two unknown friends with whom He had made an appointment on the mountain. The reflection of the rising or setting sun on the snows of Hermon, followed by a sudden clap of thunder, occasioned all the rest. But who were those secret friends more closely connected with Jesus than His most intimate apostles? This explanation only results in making this scene a got-up affair, and Jesus a charlatan. It is abandoned at the present day. Weisse, Strauss, and Keim regard the transfiguration as nothing but an invention of mythical origin, designed to represent the moral glory of Jesus under images derived from the history of Moses and Elijah. But they can never explain how the Church created a picture so complete as this out of fragments of O. T. narrative. And how could a mythical narrative occur in the midst of such precise historical notes of time as those in which it is contained in the three narrations (six or eight days after the conversation at Cæsarea, on the one hand; the eve of the cure of the lunatic child, on the other)? And Jesus' strict injunction forbidding His apostles to publish an event which never took place! We must pass here, as everywhere else, from the mythical theory to the supposition of imposture. And Peter's absurd speech—would the Church have been likely to make its founder speak after this fashion? Lastly, others have regarded the transfiguration simply as a dream of Peter's. But did the two other apostles have the same dream at the same time? And would Jesus have attached such importance to a disciple's dream as to have strictly prohibited him from relating it until after His resurrection from the dead? All these fruitless attempts prove that the denial of the fact has also its difficulties.

From innocence to holiness, and from holiness to glory; here we have the normal development of human existence, its royal path. The transfiguration, at the culminating point of the life of Jesus, shows that once at least this ideal has been realized in the history of humanity.

This narrative is one of those in which we can most clearly establish the originality and superior character of Luke's sources of information. Certainly, he has neither derived his matter from the two other evangelists, nor from a document common to all three. This is evident from these two expressions: *eight days after*, and *the elect of God* (ver. 28 and ver. 35). The details by which Luke determines for us the precise object of this scene, and the subject of Jesus' conversation with Moses and Elijah, as well as the picture he gives of the state of the disciples, are such inimitable touches, and are so suggestive for purposes of interpretation, that criticism must renounce its mission as a search after historic truth, or else decide to accord to Luke the possession of independent sources of information closely connected with the fact.

The transfiguration is the end and seal of the Galilean ministry, and at the same time the opening of the history of the passion in our three Gospels.

5. *The Cure of the Lunatic Child :* 9: 37–43*a*.—The following narrative is closely connected with the preceding in the three Syn. (Matt. 17 : 14, *et seq.* ; Mark 9 : 14, *et seq.*). There was a moral contrast which had helped tradition to keep the chronological thread.

Vers. 37–40.* *The Request.*—The sleep with which the disciples were overcome, as well as Peter's offer to Jesus, ver. 33, appear to us to prove that the transfiguration had taken place either in the evening or during the night. Jesus and His three companions came down from the mountain the next morning. A great multitude awaited them. Nevertheless, according to Mark, the arrival of Jesus excited a feeling of surprise. This impression might be attributed to a lingering reflection of glory, which still illumined His person. But a more natural explanation of it is the violent scene which had just taken place before all this crowd, which gave a peculiar opportuneness to the arrival of the Master. Matthew omits all these details, and goes straight to the fact. The symptoms of the malady, rigidity, foaming, and cries, show to what kind of physical disorder it belonged ; it was a species of epilepsy. But the 42d verse and the conversation following, in Matthew and Mark, prove that in the belief of Jesus the disorder of the nervous system was either the cause or the effect of a mental condition, of the same kind as those of which we have already had several examples (4 : 33, *et seq.*, 8 : 26, *et seq.*). According to Matthew, the attacks were of a periodical character, and were connected with the phases of the moon (*σεληνιάζεται*). Mark adds three items to the description of the malady : dumbness (in the expression *dumb demon* there is a confusion of the cause with the effect ; comp. 8 : 12, 13, 14, 23, for examples of similar confusion), grinding of the teeth, and wasting away. These are common symptoms in epilepsy.

The disciples had found themselves powerless to deal with a malady so deep-seated (it dated from the young man's childhood, Mark 5 : 22) ; and the presence of certain scribes (see Mark), who no doubt had not spared their sarcasm either against them or their Master, had both humiliated and exasperated them. The expectation of the people was therefore highly excited. What a contrast for Jesus between the hours of divine peace which He had just spent in communion with heaven, and the spectacle of the distress of this father, and of the various passions which were raging around him !

Vers. 41–43*a*. *The Answer.*—The severe exclamation of Jesus : *Faithless and perverse generation*, etc., has been applied to the disciples (Meyer) ; to the scribes (Calvin) ; to the father (Chrysostom, Grotius, Neander, De Wette) ; to the people (Olshausen). The father in Mark acknowledges his unbelief ; the scribes were completely under the power of this disposition ; the people had been shaken by their influence ; lastly, the disciples—so in Matthew Jesus expressly tells them when the scene was over—had been defeated in this case by their want of faith. All these various explanations, therefore, may be maintained. And the expression, *γενέα, generation*, the contemporary race, is sufficiently wide to comprehend all the persons present. After enjoying fellowship with celestial beings, Jesus suddenly finds Himself in the midst of a world where unbelief prevails in all its various degrees. It is therefore the

* Ver. 37. ℵ. B. L. S. omit *εν* before *τη εξης*. Ver. 38. The MSS. are divided between *επιβλεψαι* and *επιβλεψον*. Ver. 39. ℵ. D. some Mnn. It. Vg. add *και ρησσει* before *και σπαρασσει* (taken from Mark).

contrast, not between one man and another, but between this entire humanity alienated from God, in the midst of which He finds Himself, and the inhabitants of heaven whom He has just left, which wrings from Him this mournful exclamation. Διεστραμμένη, *perverse*, an expression borrowed from Deut. 32 : 5. The twice repeated question, *how long . . .?* is also explained by the contrast to the preceding scene. It is not an expression of impatience. The scene of the transfiguration has just proved that if Jesus is still upon the earth, it is by *His own free will*. The term *suffer you* implies as much. But He feels Himself a stranger in the midst of this unbelief, and He cannot suppress a sigh for the time when His filial and fraternal heart will be no longer chilled at every moment by exhibitions of feeling opposed to His most cherished aspirations. The holy enjoyment of the night before has, as it were, made Him homesick. Πρὸς ὑμᾶς, *among you*, in Luke and Mark, expresses a more active relation than μεθ' ὑμῶν, *with you*, in Matthew. The command : *Bring thy son hither*, has something abrupt in it. Jesus seems anxious to shake off the painful feeling which possesses Him ; comp. a similar expression, John 11 : 34.

There is a kind of gradation in the three narratives. Matthew, without mentioning the preceding attack, merely relates the cure ; the essential thing for him is the conversation of Jesus with His disciples which followed. In Luke, the narrative of the cure is preceded by a description of the attack. Lastly, Mark, in describing the attack, relates the remarkable conversation which Jesus had with the father of the child. This conversation, which bears the highest marks of authenticity, neither allows us to admit that Mark drew his account from either of the others, or that they had his narrative, or a narrative anything like his, in their possession ; how could Luke especially have voluntarily omitted such details ?

We shall not analyze here the dialogue in Mark in which Jesus suddenly changes the question, whether He has power to heal, into another, whether His questioner has power to believe ; after which, the latter, terrified at the responsibility thrown upon him by this turn being given to the question, invokes with anguish the power of Jesus to help his faith, which appears to him no better than unbelief. Nothing more profound or exquisite has come from the pen of any evangelist. It is the very photography of the human and paternal heart. And we are to suppose that the other evangelists had this masterpiece of Mark's before their eyes, and mutilated it ! We find these two incidents in Luke mentioned also in the raising of the widow of Nain's son : *an only son* (ver. 38) : *and He gave him to his father* (ver. 42). "They belong to Luke's manner," says the critic. But ought not the original and characteristic details with which our Gospel is full to inspire a little more confidence in his narratives ? The conversation which followed this miracle, *and which Luke omits*, is one of the passages in which the unbelief of the apostles is most severely blamed. This omission does not prove, at any rate, that the sacred writer was animated with that feeling of ill-will toward the Twelve which criticism imputes to him.

6. *The three last Incidents of Jesus' Galilean Ministry :* 9 : 43*b*–50.

1*st*. *The Second Announcement of the Passion :* vers. 43*b*–45.*—We may infer from the two other Syn. (Matt. 17 : 22, 23 ; Mark 9 : 30–32), more especially from Mark, that it was during the return from Cæsarea Philippi to Capernaum that Jesus had this second conversation with His disciples respecting His sufferings. Luke places it in connection with the state of excitement into which the minds of those who were with Jesus had been thrown by the preceding miracles. The Lord desires to suppress this dangerous excitement in the hearts of His disciples. And we can under-

* Ver. 43. The MSS. are divided between εποιησεν (T. R.) and εποιει (Alex.).

stand, therefore, why this time Jesus makes no mention of the resurrection (comp. 9 : 22). By the pronoun *ὑμεῖς*, *you*, He distinguishes the apostles from the multitude : "You who ought to know the real state of things." The expression *θέσθε εἰς τὰ ὦτα*, literally, *put this into your ears*, is very forcible. "If even you do not understand it, nevertheless impress it on your memory ; keep it as a saying." The sayings which they are thus to preserve, are those which are summarized in this very 44th verse, and not, as Meyer would have us think, the enthusiastic utterances of the people to which allusion is made in ver. 43. The *for* which follows is not opposed to this meaning, which is the only natural one : "Remember these sayings ; for incredible as they appear to you, they will not fail to be realized." The term, *be delivered into the hands of men*, refers to the counsel of God, and not to the treachery of Judas. They can know very little of the influence exercised by the will on the reason who find a difficulty in the want of understanding shown by the disciples (ver. 45). The prospect which Jesus put before them was regarded with aversion (Matt. 5 : 23), and consequently they refused to pay any serious attention to it, or even to question Jesus about it (Mark 5 : 32). Nothing more fully accords with psychological experience than this moral phenomenon indicated afresh by Luke. The following narrative will prove its reality. The *ἵνα*, *in order that*, ver. 45, does not signify simply, *so that*. The idea of purpose implied in this conjunction refers to the providential dispensation which permitted this blindness.

2*d*. The question : *Which is the greatest ?* vers. 46–48.*—This incident also must belong, according to Matthew and Mark, to the same time (Matt. 18 : 1, *et seq.* ; Mark 9 : 33, *et seq.*). According to Mark, the dispute on this question had taken place *on the road*, during their return from Cæsarea to Capernaum. "What were ye talking about by the way ?" Jesus asked them after their arrival (ver. 33) ; and it was then that the following scene took place in a house, which, according to Matthew, was probably Peter's. We have several other indications of a serious dispute between the disciples happening about this time ; for example, that admonition preserved by Mark at the end of the discourse spoken by Jesus on this occasion (9 : 50) : "Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace among yourselves ;" then there is the instruction of Jesus on the conduct to be pursued in the case of offences between brethren, Matt. 18 : 15 : "If thy brother sin against thee . . . ;" lastly, the question of Peter : "How many times am I to forgive my brother ?" and the answer of Jesus, 18 : 21, 22. All these sayings belong to the period of the return to Capernaum, and are indications of a serious altercation between the disciples. According to the highly dramatic account of Mark, it is Jesus himself who takes the initiative, and who questions them as to the subject of their dispute. Shame-stricken, like guilty children, at first they are silent ; they then make up their minds to avow what the question was about which they had quarrelled. Each had put forward his claims to the first place, and depreciated those of the rest. Peter had been the most eager, and, perhaps, the most severely handled. We see how superficial was the impression made on them by the announcement of their Master's sufferings. Jesus then seated Himself (Mark 5 : 35), and gathering the Twelve about Him, gave them the following instruction. All these circumstances are omitted by Matthew. In his concise way of dealing with facts, contrary to all moral probability, he puts the question : *Which of us is the*

* Ver. 47. ℵ. B. F. K. L. Π, several Mnn. Syr. read *ειδως* instead of *ιδων*. B. C. D., *παιδιον* instead of *παιδιον*. Ver. 48. ℵ. B. C. L. X. Z. some Mnn Itplerique, *εστιν* instead of *εσται*.

greatest? into the mouth of the disciples who address it to Jesus. All he regards as important is the teaching given on the occasion. As to Luke, Bleek, pressing the words ἐν αὐτοῖς, *in them*, supposes that, according to him, we have simply to do with the thoughts which had arisen in the hearts of the disciples (comp. ver. 47, τῆς καρδίας), and not with any outward quarrel. But the term εἰσῆλθε, *occurred*, indicates a positive fact, just such as that Mark so graphically describes; and the expression *in them*, or *among them*, applies to the circle of the disciples in the midst of which this discussion had taken place. Jesus takes a child, and makes him the subject of His demonstration. It is a law of heaven, that the feeblest creature here below shall enjoy the largest measure of heavenly help and tenderness (Matt. 18 : 10). In conformity with this law of heaven Jesus avows a peculiar interest in children, and commends them to the special care of His own people. Whoever entering into His views receives them as such, receives Him. He receives Jesus as the riches which have come to fill the void of his own existence, which in itself is so poor, and in Jesus, God, who, as a consequence of the same principle, is the constant complement of the existence of Jesus (John 6 : 57). Consequently, for a man to devote himself from love to Jesus to the service of the little ones, and so make himself *the least*, is to be on the road toward possessing God most completely, and becoming *the greatest*.

The meaning of Jesus' words in Matthew is somewhat different, at least as far as concerns the first part of the answer. Here Jesus lays down as the measure of true greatness, not a tender sympathy for the little, but the feeling of one's own littleness. The child set in the midst is not presented to the disciples as one in whom they are to interest themselves, but as an example of the feeling with which they must themselves be possessed. It is an invitation to return to their infantine humility and simplicity, rather than to love the little ones. It is only in the 5th verse that Matthew passes from this idea, by a natural transition, to that which is contained in the answer of Jesus as given by Luke and Mark. It is probable that the first part of the answer in Matthew is borrowed from another scene, which we find occurring later in Mark (10 : 13–16) and Luke (18 : 15–17), as well as in Matthew himself (19 : 13–15); this Gospel combines here, as usual, in a single discourse elements belonging to different occasions. Meyer thinks that in this expression, *receive in my name*, the *in my name* refers not to the disposition of him who receives, but of him who is received, in so far as he presents himself as a disciple of Jesus. But these two notions: presenting one's self in the name of Jesus (consciously or unconsciously), and being received in this name, cannot be opposed one to the other. As soon as the welcome takes place, one becomes united with the other. The Alex. reading ἐστί, *is*, is more spiritual than the Byz. ἔσται, *shall be*, which has an eschatological meaning. It is difficult to decide between them.

3*d. The Dissenting Disciple*: vers. 49 and 50.*—Only in some very rare cases does John play an active part in the Gospel history. But he appears to have been at this time in a state of great excitement; comp. the incident which immediately follows (9 : 54, *et seq.*), and another a little later (Matt. 20 : 20, *et seq.*). He had no

* Ver. 49. ℵ. B. L. X. Δ. Z. some Mnn. read εν τω in place of επι τω (εν perhaps taken from Mark). ℵ. B. L. Z. It$^{\text{aliq.}}$, εκωλυομεν instead of εκωλυσαμεν. Ver. 50. C. D. F. L. M. Z. add αυτον to μη κωλυετε. They read καθ' υμων and υπερ υμων in ℵ$^{\text{cb}}$ B. C. D. K. L. M. Z. Π. several Mnn. It. Syr.; καθ' υμων and υπερ ημων in ℵ* A. X. Δ. some Mnn.: and καθ' ημων and υπερ ημων in T. R., according to ℵ$^{\text{ca}}$ E. F. G. H. S U. V. Γ. Λ. and most of the Mnn.

doubt been one of the principal actors in the incident related here by himself, and which might very easily have had some connection with the dispute which had just been going on. The link of connection is more simple than criticism imagines. The importance which Jesus had just attributed to *His name* in the preceding answer, makes John fear that he has violated by his rashness the majesty of this august name. When once in the way of confession, he feels that he must make a clean breast of it. This connection is indicated by the terms ἀποκριθείς (Luke) and ἀπεκρίθη (Mark). This incident, placed here in close connection with the preceding, helps us to understand some parts of the lengthened discourse, Matt. 18, which certainly belongs to this period. These little ones, whom care must be taken not to offend (ver. 6), whom the good shepherd seeks to save (vers. 11–13), and of whom not one by God's will shall perish (ver. 14), are doubtless beginners in the faith, such as he was toward whom the apostles had shown such intolerance. Thus it very often happens, that by bringing together separate stones scattered about in our three narratives, we succeed in reconstructing large portions of the edifice, and then, by joining it to the Gospel of John, the entire building.

The fact here mentioned is particularly interesting. "We see," as Meyer says, "that even outside the circle of the permanent disciples of Jesus there were men in whom His word and His works had called forth a higher and miraculous power; these sparks, which fell beyond the circle of His disciples, had made flames burst forth here and there away from the central fire." Was it desirable to extinguish these fires? It was a delicate question. Such men, though they had never lived in the society of Jesus, acquired a certain authority, and might use it to disseminate error. With this legitimate fear on the part of the Twelve there was no doubt mingled a reprehensible feeling of jealousy. They no longer had the monopoly of the work of Christ. Jesus instantly discerned this taint of evil in the conduct which they had just pursued. In Luke, as in Mark, instead of the aor. ἐκωλύσαμεν, *we forbade him*, some MSS. read the imperf. ἐκωλύομεν: "We were forbidding him, and thought we were doing right; were we deceived?" Their opposition was only tentative, inasmuch as Jesus had not sanctioned it. This is the preferable reading.

The answer of Jesus is full of broad and exalted feeling. The divine powers which emanate from Him could not be completely contained in any visible society, not even in that of the Twelve. The fact of spiritual union with Him takes precedence of social communion with the other disciples. So far from treating a man who makes use of His name as an adversary, he must rather be regarded, even in his isolated position, as a useful auxiliary. Of the three readings offered by the MSS. in ver. 50, and which are also found in Mark (*against you—for you; against you—for us; against us—for us*), it appears to me that we must prefer the first: "He who is not *against you*, is *for you*. The authority of the Alex. MSS., which read in this way, is confirmed by that of the ancient versions, the *Italic* and the *Peschito*, and still more by the context. The person of Jesus is not in fact involved in this conflict—is it not in His name that the man acts? As a matter of fact, it is the Twelve who are concerned: "he followeth not *with us*;" this is the grievance (ver. 49). It is quite different in the similar and apparently contradictory saying (Luke 11 : 23; Matt. 12 : 30): "He who is not with me, is against me." The difference between these two declarations consists in this: in the second case, it is the personal honor of Jesus which is at stake. He opposes the expulsions of demons, which He effects, to those of the Jewish exorcists. These latter appear to be laboring with Him against a com-

mon enemy, but really they are strengthening the enemy. In the application which we might make of these maxims at the present day, the former would apply to brethren who, while separated from us ecclesiastically, are fighting with us for the cause of Christ ; while the latter would apply to men who, although belonging to the same religious society as ourselves, are sapping the foundations of the gospel. We should have the sense to regard the first as allies, although found in a different camp ; the others as enemies, although found in our own camp.

Mark introduces between the two parts of this reply a remarkable saying, the import of which is, that no one need fear that a man who does such works in the name of Jesus will readily pass over to the ranks of those who speak evil of Him, that is to say, of those who accuse Him of casting out devils by Beelzebub. After having invoked the name of Jesus in working a cure, to bring such an accusation against Jesus would be to accuse himself.

Nowhere, perhaps, is the fitting of the Syn. one into the other, albeit quite undesigned, more remarkable. In Matthew the words, without the occasion of them (the dispute between the disciples) ; in Luke the incident, with a brief saying having reference to it ; in Mark the incident, with some very graphic and much more circumstantial details than in Luke, and a discourse which resembles in part that in Matthew, but differs from both by omissions and additions which are equally important. Is not the mutual independence of the three traditional narratives palpably proved ?

FOURTH PART.

JOURNEY FROM GALILEE TO JERUSALEM.

CHAP. 9 : 51–19 : 28.

A GREAT contrast marks the synoptical narrative : that between the ministry in Galilee and the passion week at Jerusalem. According to Matthew (19 : 1–20 : 34) and Mark (chap. 10), the short journey from Capernaum to Judea through Perea forms the rapid transition between those two parts of the ministry of Jesus. Nothing, either in the distance between the places, or in the number of the facts related, would lead us to suppose that this journey lasted more than a few days. This will appear from the following table :

MATTHEW.	MARK.	LUKE.
Conversation about divorce.	Same as Matt.	Wanting.
Presentation of the children.	*Id.*	Same as Matt.
The rich young man.	*Id.*	*Id.*
Parable of the laborers.	Wanting.	Wanting.
Third announcement of the passion.	Same as Matt.	Same as in Matt.
The request of Zebedee's sons.	*Id.*	Wanting.
Cure of the blind man of Jericho.	*Id.*	Same as Matt.
Wanting.	Wanting.	Zacchæus.
Id.	*Id.*	Parable of the pounds.

The fourth part of the Gospel of Luke, which begins at 9 : 51, gives us a very different idea of what transpired at that period. Here we find the description of a slow and lengthened journey across the southern regions of Galilee, which border on Samaria. Jerusalem is, and remains, the fixed goal of the journey (ver. 51, 13 : 22, 17 : 11, etc.). But Jesus proceeds only by short stages, stopping at each locality to preach the gospel. Luke does not say what direction He followed. But we may gather it from the first fact related by him. At the first step which He ventures to take with His followers on the Samaritan territory, He is stopped short by the ill-will excited against Him by national prejudice ; so that even if His intention had been to repair directly to Jerusalem through Samaria (which we do not believe to have been the case), He would have been obliged to give up that intention, and turn eastward, in order to take the other route, that of Perea. Jesus therefore slowly approached the Jordan, with the view of crossing that river to the south of the lake Gennesaret, and of continuing His journey thereafter through Perea. The inference thus drawn from the narrative of Luke is positively confirmed by Matthew (19 : 1) and Mark (10 : 1), both of whom indicate the Perean route as that which Jesus followed after His de-

parture from Galilee. In this way the three synoptics coincide anew from Luke 18 : 15 onward ; and from the moment at which the narrative of Luke rejoins the two others, we have to regard the facts related by him as having passed in Perea. This slow journeying, first from west to east across southern Galilee, then from north to south through Perea, the description of which fills ten whole chapters, that is to say, more than a third of Luke's narrative, forms in this Gospel a real section intermediate between the two others (the description of the Galilean ministry and that of the passion week) ; it is a third group of narratives corresponding in importance to the two others so abruptly brought into juxtaposition in Mark and Matthew, and which softens the contrast between them.

But can we admit with certainty the historical reality of this evangelistic journey in southern Galilee, which forms one of the characteristic features of the third Gospel? Many modern critics refuse to regard it as historical. They allege :

1. The entire absence of any analogous account in Matthew and Mark. Matthew, indeed, relates only two solitary facts (Matt. 8 : 19 *et seq.* and 12 : 21 *et seq.*) of all those which Luke describes in the ten chapters of which this section consists, up to the moment when the three narratives again become parallel (Luke 18 : 14) ; Mark, not a single one.

2. The visit of Jesus to Martha and Mary, which Luke puts in this journey (10 : 38–42), can have taken place only in Judea, at Bethany ; likewise the saying, 13 : 34, 35, cannot well have been uttered by Jesus elsewhere than at Jerusalem in the temple (Matt. 23 : 37–39). Do not these errors of time and place cast a more than suspicious light on the narrative of the entire journey. M. Sabatier himself, who thoroughly appreciates the important bearing of this narrative in Luke on the harmony of the four Gospels, nevertheless goes the length of saying : " We see with how many contradictions and material impossibilities this narrative abounds." *

It has been attempted to defend Luke, by alleging that he did not mean to relate a journey, and that this section was only a collection of doctrinal utterances arranged in the order of their subjects, and intended to show the marvellous wisdom of Jesus. It is impossible for us to admit this explanation, with Luke's own words before us, which express and recall from time to time his intention of describing a consecutive journey : 9 : 51, " He steadfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem ;" 13 : 22, " He was going through the cities and villages . . . journeying toward Jerusalem ;" 17 : 11 (lit. trans.), " And it came to pass, as He went to Jerusalem, that He traversed the country between Samaria and Galilee."

Wieseler, taking up an entirely opposite point of view, finds in those three passages the indications of as many individual journeys, which he connects with three journeys to Jerusalem placed by John almost at the same epoch. It is hoped in this way to find the point of support for Luke's narrative in the fourth Gospel, which is wanting to it in the two first. The departure mentioned 9 : 51 would correspond with the journey of Jesus, John 7 : 1–10 : 39 (feast of Tabernacles and of Dedication), a journey which terminates in a sojourn in Perea (John 10 : 40 *et seq.*). The mention of a journey 13 : 22 would refer to the journey from Perea to Bethany for the raising of Lazarus, John 11, after which Jesus repairs to Ephraim. Finally, the passage 17 : 11 would correspond with the journey from Ephraim to Jerusalem for the last Passover (John 11 : 55). It would be necessary to admit that Jesus, after His

* " Essai sur les Sources de la Vie de Jésus," p. 29.

Ephraim sojourn, made a last visit to Galilee, proceeding thither through Samaria (Wieseler translates Luke 17 : 11 as in E. V., "through the midst of Samaria and Galilee"), then that He returned to Judea through Perea (Matt. 19 ; Mark 10).

We cannot allow that this view has the least probability. 1. Those three passages in Luke plainly do not indicate, in his mind at least, three different departures and journeys. They are way-marks set up by the author on the route of Jesus, in the account of this unique journey, by which he recalls from time to time the general situation described 9 : 51, on account of the slowness and length of the progress. 2. The departure (9 : 51) took place, as the sending of the seventy disciples proves, with the greatest publicity ; it is not therefore identical with the departure (John 7 : 1 *et seq.*), which took place, as it were, in secret ; Jesus undoubtedly did not then take with Him more than one or two of His most intimate disciples. 3. The interpretation which Wieseler gives of 17 : 11 appears to us inadmissible (see the passage). It must therefore be acknowledged, not only that Luke meant in those ten chapters to relate a journey, but that he meant to relate one, and only one.

Others think that he intended to produce in the minds of his readers the idea of a continuous journey, but that this is a framework of fiction which has no corresponding reality. De Wette and Bleek suppose that, after having finished his account of the Galilean ministry, Luke still possessed a host of important materials, without any determinate localities or dates, and that, rather than lose them, he thought good to insert them here, between the description of the Galilean ministry and that of the passion, while grouping them in the form of a recorded journey. Holtzmann takes for granted that those materials were nothing else than the contents of his second principal source, the Logia of Matthew, which Luke has placed here, after employing up till this point his first source, the original Mark. Weizsäcker, who thinks, on the contrary, that the Logia of Matthew are almost exactly reproduced in the great groups of discourses which the first contains, sees in this fourth part of Luke a collection of sayings derived by him from those great discourses of Matthew, and arranged systematically with regard to the principal questions which were agitated in the apostolic churches (the account of the feast, 14 : 1–35, alluding to the Agapæ) ; the discourses, 15 : 1–17 : 10, to questions relative to the admission of Gentiles, etc.).

Of course, according to those three points of view, the historical introductions with which Luke prefaces each of those teachings would be more or less his own invention. He deduces them himself from those teachings, as we might do at the present day. As to the rest, Bleek expressly remarks that this view leaves entirely intact the historical truth of the sayings of Jesus in themselves. We shall gather up in the course of our exegesis the data which can enlighten us on the value of those hypotheses ; but at the outset we must offer the following observations : 1. In thus inventing an entire phase of the ministry of Jesus, Luke would put himself in contradiction to the programme marked out (1 : 1–4), where he affirms that he has endeavored to reproduce historical truth exactly. 2. What purpose would it serve knowingly to enrich the ministry of Jesus with a fictitious phase ? Would it not have been much simpler to distribute those different pieces along the course of the Galilean ministry ? 3. Does a conscientious historian play thus with the matter of which he treats, especially when that matter forms the object of his religious faith ? If Luke had really acted in this way, we should require, with Baur, to take a step further, and ascribe to this fiction a more serious intention—that of establishing, by these prolonged relations of Jesus to the Samaritans, the Pauline universalism ? Thus it is that criti-

cism, logically carried out in questions relating to the Gospels, always lands us in this dilemma—historical truth or deliberate imposture.

The historical truth of this journey, as Luke describes it, appears to us evident from the following facts : 1. Long or short, a journey from Galilee to Judea through Perea must have taken place ; so much is established by the narratives of Matthew and Mark, and indirectly confirmed by that of John, when he mentions a sojourn in Perea precisely at the same epoch (10 : 40–42). 2. The duration of this journey must have been much more considerable than appears from a hasty glance at the first two synoptics. How, in reality, are we to fill the six or seven months which separated the feast of Tabernacles (John 7, month of October) from that of the Passover, at which Jesus died ? The few accounts, Matt. 19 and 20 (Mark 10), cannot cover such a gap. Scarcely is there wherewith to fill up the space of a week. Where, then, did Jesus pass all that time ? And what did He do ? It is usually answered, that from the feast of Tabernacles to that of the Dedication (December) He remained in Judea. That is not possible. He must have gone to Jerusalem in a sort of *incognito* and by way of surprise, in order to appear unexpectedly in that city, and to prevent the police measures which a more lengthened sojourn in Judea would have allowed His enemies to take against Him. And after the violent scenes related John 7 : 1–10 : 21, He must have remained peacefully there for more than two whole months ! Such an idea is irreconcilable with the situation described John 6 : 1 and 7 : 1–13.

Jesus therefore, immediately after rapidly executing that journey, returned to Galilee. This return, no doubt, is not mentioned ; but no more is that which followed John 5. It is understood, as a matter of course, that so long as a new scene of action is not indicated in the narrative, the old one continues. After the stay at Jerusalem at the feast of Dedication (John 10 : 22 *et seq.*), it is expressly said that Jesus sojourned in Perea (vers. 40–42) ; there we have the first indication apprising us that the long sojourn in Galilee had come to an end. Immediately, therefore, after the feast of Tabernacles, Jesus returned to Galilee, and it was then that He definitely bade adieu to that province, and set out, as we read Luke 9 : 51, to approach Jerusalem slowly and while preaching the gospel. Not only is such a journey possible, but it is in a manner forced on us by the necessity of providing contents for that blank interval in the ministry of Jesus. 3. The indications which Luke supplies respecting the scene of this journey have nothing in them but what is exceedingly probable. After His first visit to Nazareth, Jesus settled at Capernaum ; He made it *His own city* (Matt. 9 : 1), and the centre of His excursions (Luke 4 : 31 *et seq.*). Very soon He considerably extended the radius of His journeys on the side of western Galilee (Nain 7 : 11). Then He quitted His Capernaum residence, and commenced a ministry purely itinerant (8 : 1 *et seq.*). To this period belong His first visit to Decapolis, to the east of the lake of Gennesaret, and the multiplication of the loaves, to the north-east of that sea. Finally, we learn from Matthew and Mark that Jesus made two other great excursions into the northern regions—the one to the north-west toward Phœnicia (Luke's great lacuna), the other toward the north-east, to the sources of the Jordan (Cæsarea Philippi, and the transfiguration). To accomplish His mission toward Galilee there thus remained to be visited only the southern parts of this province on the side of Samaria. What more natural, consequently, than the direction which He followed in this journey, slowly passing over that southern part of Galilee from west to east which He had not before visited, and from

which He could make some excursions among that Samaritan people, at whose hands He had found so eager a welcome at the beginning of His ministry?

Regarding the visit to Martha and Mary, and the saying 13 : 34, 35, we refer to the explanation of the passages. Perhaps the first is a trace (unconscious on the part of Luke) of Jesus' short sojourn at Jerusalem at the feast of Dedication. In any case, the narrative of Luke is thus found to form the natural transition between the synoptical accounts and that of John. And if we do not find in Luke that multiplicity of journeys to Jerusalem which forms the distinctive feature of John's Gospel, we shall at least meet with the intermediate type of a ministry, a great part of which (the Galilean work once finished) assumes the form of a prolonged pilgrimage in the direction of Jerusalem.

As to the contents of the ten chapters embraced in this part of Luke, they are perfectly in keeping with the situation. Jesus carries along with Him to Judea all the following of devoted believers which He has found in Galilee, the nucleus of His future Church. From this band will go forth the army of evangelists which, with the apostles at its head, will shortly enter upon the conquest of the world in His name. To prepare them as they travel along for this task—such is His constant aim. He prosecutes it directly in two ways: by sending them on a mission before Him, as formerly He had sent the Twelve, and making them serve, as these had done, a first apprenticeship to their future work; then, by bringing to bear on them the chief part of His instructions respecting that emancipation from the world and its goods which was to be the distinctive character of the life of His servants, and thus gaining them wholly for the great task which He allots to them.*

What are the sources of Luke in this part which is peculiar to him? According to Holtzmann, Luke here gives us the contents of Matthew's Logia, excepting the introductions, which he adds or amplifies. We shall examine this whole hypothesis hereafter. According to Schleiermacher, this narrative is the result of the combination of two accounts derived from the journals of two companions of Jesus, the one of whom took part in the journey at the feast of Dedication, the other in that of the last Passover. Thus he explains the exactness of the details, and at the same time the apparent inexactness with which a visit to Bethany is found recorded in the midst of a series of scenes in Galilee. According to this view, the short introductions placed as headings to the discourses are worthy of special confidence. But

* We cannot help recalling here the admirable picture which Eusebius draws of the body of evangelists who, under Trajan, continued the work of those whom Jesus had trained with so much care: "Alongside of him (Quadratus) there flourished at that time many other successors of the apostles, who, admirable disciples of those great men, reared the edifice on the foundations which they laid, continuing the work of preaching the gospel, and scattering abundantly over the whole earth the wholesome seed of the heavenly kingdom. For a very large number of His disciples, carried away by fervent love of the truth which the divine word had revealed to them, fulfilled the command of the Saviour to divide their goods among the poor. Then, taking leave of their country, they filled the office of evangelists, coveting eagerly to preach Christ, and to carry the glad tidings of God to those who had not yet heard the word of faith. And after laying the foundations of the faith in some remote and barbarous countries, establishing pastors among them, and confiding to them the care of those young settlements, without stopping longer, they hasted on to other nations, attended by the grace and virtue of God" (ed. Lœmmer, iii. 38). Such were the spiritual children of those whom Jesus had equipped on this journey, which some have reckoned an invention of Luke.

how has this fusion of the two writings which has merged the two journeys into one been brought about? Luke cannot have produced it consciously; it must have existed in his sources. The difficulty is only removed a stage. How was it possible for the two accounts of different journeys to be fused into a unique whole? As far as we are concerned, all that we believe it possible to say regarding the source from which Luke drew is, that the document must have been either Aramaic, or translated from Aramaic. To be convinced of this, we need only read the verse, 9 : 51, which forms the heading of the narrative.

If we were proceeding on the relation of Luke to the two other synoptics, we should divide this part into two cycles—that in which Luke moves alone (9 : 51–18 : 14), and that in which he moves parallel to them (18 : 15–19 : 27). But that division has nothing corresponding to it in the mind of the author, who probably knows neither of the two other canonical accounts. He himself divides his narrative into three cycles by the three observations with which he marks it off: 1*st.* 9 : 51–13 : 21 (9 : 51, the resolution to depart; 2*d.* 13 : 22–17 : 10 (13 : 22, the direction of the journey); 3*d.* 17 : 11–19 : 27 (17 : 11, the scene of the journey). Such, then, will be our division.

FIRST CYCLE.—CHAP. 9 : 51–13 : 21.

The Departure from Galilee.—First Period of the Journey.

1. *Unfavorable Reception by the Samaritans:* 9 : 51–56.—Ver. 51. *Introduction.*—The style of this verse is peculiarly impressive and solemn. The expressions ἐγένετο . . . καὶ ἐστήρίξε πρόσωπον στηρίζειν betray an Aramaic original. The verb συμπληροῦσθαι, *to be fulfilled*, means here, as in Acts 2 : 1, the gradual filling up of a series of days which form a complete period, and extend to a goal determined beforehand; comp. πλησθῆναι, 2 : 21, 22. The period here is that of the days of the departing of Jesus from this world; it began with the first announcement of His sufferings, and it had now reached one of its marked epochs, the departure from Galilee. The goal is the ἀνάλημψις *the perfecting* of Jesus; this expression combines the two ideas of His death and ascension. Those two events, of which the one is the complement of the other, form together the consummation of His return to the Father; comp. the same combination of ideas in ὑψωθῆναι and ὑπάγειν, John 3 : 14, 8 : 28, 12 : 32, 13 : 3. For the plural ἡμέραι, Luke 1 : 21, 22. Wieseler (in his Synopsis) formerly gave to ἀνάλημψις the meaning of *good reception*: "When the time of the favorable reception which He had found in Galilee was coming to an end." But as this meaning would evidently require some such definition as ἐν Γαλιλαίᾳ, he now understands by ἡμέρ. ἀναλ., "the days during which Jesus should have been received by men" ("Beiträge," etc., p. 127 *et seq.*). But how can we give to a substantive the meaning of a verb in the conditional? and besides, comp. Acts 1 : 2, which fixes the meaning of ἀνάλημψις. On the other hand, when Meyer concludes from the passage in Acts that the ascension only is here referred to, he forgets the difference of context. In Acts 1 this meaning is evident, the death being already a past event; but here it is difficult to believe that the two events yet to come, by which the departure of Jesus to heaven (ἀνάλημψις) was to be consummated, are not comprehended in this word. The pronoun αὐτός, by emphasizing the subject, brings into prominence the free and deliberate character of this departure. On the καί of the apodosis, see pp. 83, 84. This καί (*and* He *also*) recalls the correspondence between the divine

decree implied in the term *συμπληροῦσθαι*, *to be fulfilled*, and the free will with which Jesus conforms thereto. The phrase *πρόσωπον στηρίζειν* corresponds in the LXX. to שׂוּם פָּנִים (Jer. 21 : 10) or נָתַן פָּנִים (Ezek. 6 : 2), *dresser sa face vers* (Ostervald), to give one's view an invariable direction toward an end. The expression supposes a fear to be surmounted, an energy to be displayed. On the prepositional phrase *to Jerusalem*, comp. 9 : 31 and Mark 10 : 32 : "And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem ; and Jesus went before them : and as they followed they were afraid." To start for Jerusalem is to march to His death ; Jesus knows it ; the disciples have a presentiment of danger. This confirms our interpretation of *ἀνάληψις*.

Vers. 52–56.* *The Refusal.*—This tentative message of Jesus does not prove, as Meyer and Bleek think, that He had the intention of penetrating farther into Samaria, and of going directly to Jerusalem in that way. He desired to do a work in the north of that province, like that which had succeeded so admirably in the south (John 4).

The sending of messengers was indispensable, on account of the numerous retinue which accompanied Him. The reading *πόλιν* (ver. 52), though less supported, appears to us preferable to the reading *κώμην*, which is probably taken from ver. 56. In general, the Samaritans put no obstacle in the way of Jews travelling through their country. It was even by this route, according to Josephus, that the Galileans usually went to Jerusalem : but Samaritan toleration did not go so far as to offer hospitality. The aim of Jesus was to remove the wall which for long centuries had separated the two peoples. The Hebraism, *τὸ πρόσωπον πορευόμενον* (ver. 53), פְּנֵים הֹלְכִים (Ex. 33 : 14 ; 2 Sam. 17 : 11), proves an Aramaic document. The conduct of James and John betrays a state of exaltation, which was perhaps still due to the impression produced by the transfiguration scene. The proposal which they make to Jesus seems to be related to the recent appearance of Elias. This remark does not lose its truth, even if the words, *as did Elias*, which several Alex. omit, are not authentic.

Perhaps this addition was meant to extenuate the fault of the disciples ; but it may also have been left out to prevent the rebuke of Jesus from falling on the prophet, or because the Gnostics employed this passage against the authority of the O. T. (Tertullian, Adv. Marc. iv. 23). The most natural supposition after all is, that the passage is an explanatory gloss. Is the surname of *sons of thunder*, given by Jesus to James and John, to be dated from this circumstance? We think not. Jesus would not have perpetuated the memory of a fault committed by His two beloved disciples. The phrase, *He turned* (ver. 55), is explained by the fact that Jesus was walking at the head of the company. A great many Alex. and Byz. mss. agree in rejecting the last words of this verse, *And said, Ye know not ;* but the oldest versions, the Itala and Peschito, confirm its authenticity ; and it is probable that the cause of the omission is nothing else than the confounding of the words *KAI EME* with the following

* Ver. 52. ℵ. Γ. Δ. 24 Mnn. It. Vg. read *πολιν* instead of *κωμην*. Ver. 54. ℵ. B. some Mnn. omit *αυτου* after *μαθηται*. ℵ. B. L. Z. 2 Mnn. It$^{\text{aliq.}}$ Syr$^{\text{cur.}}$ omit the words *ως και Ηλιας εποιησεν*. Ver. 55. ℵ. A. B. C. E. G. H. L. S. V. X. Δ. Z. 64 Mnn. omit the words *και ειπεν ουκ οιδατε οιου πνευματος εστε υμεις*, which are found in D. F$^{\text{w}}$. K. M. U. Γ. Δ. Π. the majority of the Mnn. Syr. It$^{\text{plerique}}$. Ver. 56. The T. R. adds at the beginning of the verse : *ο γαρ υιος του ανθρωπου ουκ ηλθε ψυχας ανθρωπων απολεσαι αλλα σωσαι*, following F$^{\text{w}}$. K. M. U. Γ. Δ. Π. almost all the Mnn. Syr. It$^{\text{plerique}}$. These words are omitted in the other 14 Mjj. 65 Mnn. It$^{\text{aliq.}}$.

ΚΑΙ ΕΠορεύθη. They may be understood in three ways: either interrogatively, "Know ye not what is the new spiritual reign which I bring in, and of which you are to be the instruments, that of meekness?" or affirmatively, with the same sense, "Ye know not yet . . ." The third meaning is much more severe: "Ye know not of what spirit you are the instruments when speaking thus; you think that you are working a miracle of faith in my service, but you are obeying a spirit alien from mine." This last meaning, which is that of St. Augustine and of Calvin, is more in keeping with the expression *ἐπετίμησεν, He rebuked them.*

The following words (ver. 56), *For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them*, are wanting in the same authorities as the preceding, and in the Cantabrigian besides. It is a gloss brought in from 19 : 10 and Matt. 18 · 11. In these words there are, besides, numerous variations, as is usual in interpolated passages. Here, probably, we have the beginning of those many alterations in the text which are remarked in this piece. The copyists, rendered distrustful by the first gloss, seem to have taken the liberty of making arbitrary corrections in the rest of the passage. The suspicion of Gnostic interpolations may have equally contributed to the same result.

Jesus offered, but did not impose Himself (8 : 37); He withdrew. Was the other village where He was received Jewish or Samaritan? Jewish, most probably; otherwise the difference of treatment experienced in two villages belonging to the same people would have been more expressly emphasized.

2. *The Three Disciples:* 9 : 57-62.—Two of these short episodes are also connected in Matthew (chap. 8); but by him they are placed at the time when Jesus is setting out on His excursion into Decapolis. Meyer and Weizsäcker prefer the situation indicated by Matthew. The sequel will show what we are to think of that opinion.

1*st.* Vers. 57 and 58.* Luke says, *a certain man;* in Matthew it is a scribe. Why this difference, if they follow the same document? The homage of the man breathed a blind confidence in his own strength. The answer of Jesus is a call to self-examination. To follow such a Master *whithersoever He goeth*, more is needed than a good resolution; he must walk in the way of self-mortification (9 : 23).† The word *κατασκήνωσις* strictly denotes shelter under foliage, as opposed to holes in the earth. Night by night Jesus received from the hand of His Father a resting-place, which He knew not in the morning; the beasts were better off in respect of comfort. The name *Son of man* is employed with precision here to bring out the contrast between the Lord of creation and His poorest subjects. This offer and answer are certainly put more naturally at the time of final departure from Galilee, than at the beginning of a few hours' or a few days' excursion, as in Matthew.

2*d.* Vers. 59, 60.‡ Luke says, *another* (individual); Matthew, *another of His disciples.* The scribe had offered himself; this latter is addressed by Jesus. Luke alone indicates the contrast which the succeeding conversation explains. Here we

* Ver. 57. ℵ. B. D. L. Z. some Mnn. It$^{alliq.}$ omit *κυριε.*

† The following is M. Rénan's commentary on this saying: "His vagrant life, at first full of charms for him, began to weigh heavily on him" ("Vie de Jésus," 13th ed. p. 337). Here certainly is one of the strangest liberties with the history of Jesus which this author has allowed himself. The saying breathes, on the contrary, the most manly courage.

‡ Ver. 59. B. D. V. omit *κυριε.*

have no more a man of impulse, presumptuous and without self-distrust. On the contrary, we have a character reflecting and wary even to excess. Jesus has more confidence in him than in the former ; He stimulates instead of correcting him. Could the answer which He gives him (ver. 60) be altogether justified in the situation which Matthew indicates, and if what was contemplated was only a short expedition, in which this man without inconvenience could have taken part ? In the position indicated by Luke, the whole aspect of the matter changes. The Lord is setting out, not again to return ; will he who remains behind at this decisive moment ever rejoin Him ? There are critical periods in the moral life, when that which is not done at the moment will never be done. The Spirit blows ; its action over, the ship will never succeed in getting out of port. But, it is said, to bury a father is a sacred duty ; Jesus has no right to set aside such a duty. But there may be conflicting duties ; the law itself provided for one, in cases analogous to that which is before us. The high priest and the Nazarites, or *consecrated ones*, were not to pollute themselves for the dead, were it even their father or mother (Lev. 21 : 11 ; Num. 6 : 6, 7) ; that is to say, they could neither touch the body to pay it the last duties, nor enter the house where it lay (Num. 19 : 14), nor take part in the funeral meal (Hos. 9 : 4). All that Jesus does here is to apply the moral principle implicitly laid down by the law—to wit, that in case of conflict, spiritual duty takes precedence of the law of propriety. If his country be attacked, a citizen will leave his father's body to run to the frontier ; if his own life be threatened, the most devoted son will take to flight, leaving to others the care of paying the last honors to his father's remains. Jesus calls upon this man to do for the life of his soul what every son would do for that of his body. It must be remembered that the pollution contracted by the presence of a dead body lasted seven days (Num. 19 : 11–22). What would have happened to this man during these seven days ? His impressions would have been chilled. Already Jesus saw him plunged anew in the tide of his ordinary life, lost to the kingdom of God. There was needed in this case a decision like that which Jesus had just taken Himself (ver. 51). Ἀπελθών (strictly, *from the spot*) is opposed to every desire of delay ; the higher mission, the spiritual Nazariteship, begins immediately. From the word *dead*, on the double meaning of which the answer of Jesus turns, there is suggested the judgment which He passed on human nature before its renewal by the gospel. This saying is parallel to that other, "If ye who are evil . . ." and to Paul's declaration, "Ye were dead in your sins . . ." (Eph. 2 : 1). The command, "Preach the kingdom of God," justifies, by the sublimity of the object, the sacrifice demanded. The διά in διάγγελλε indicates diffusion. The mission of the seventy disciples, which immediately follows, sets this command in its true light. Jesus had a place for this man to fill in that army of evangelists which He purposed to send before Him, and which at a later date was to labor in changing the aspect of the world. Everything in this scene is explained by the situation in which Luke places it. Clement of Alexandria relates (Strom. 3 : 4) that the name of this man was Philip. In any case, it could not have been the apostle of that name who had long been following Jesus (John 6) ; but might it not be the deacon Philip, who afterward played so important a part as deacon and evangelist in the primitive Church ? If it is so, we can understand why Jesus did not allow such a prize to escape Him.

3d. Vers. 61, 62. This third instance belongs only to Luke. It is, as it were, the synthesis of the two others. This man offers himself, like the first ; and yet he tem-

porizes like the second. The word ἀποτάσσεσθαι, strictly, *to leave one's place in the ranks*, rather denotes here separation from the members of his house, than renunciation of his goods (14:33). The preposition εἰς, which follows τοῖς, is better explained by taking the pronoun in the masculine sense. There are, in the answer of Jesus, at once a call to examine himself, and a summons to a more thorough decision. The figure is that of a man who, while engaged in labor (aor. ἐπιβαλών), instead of keeping his eye on the furrow which he is drawing (pres. βλέπων), looks behind at some object which attracts his interest. He is only half at work, and half work only will be the result. What will come of the divine work in the hands of a man who devotes himself to it with a heart preoccupied with other cares? A heroic impulse, without afterthought, is the condition of Christian service. In the words, *fit for the kingdom of God*, the two ideas of self-discipline and of work to influence others are not separated, as indeed they form but one. This summons to entire renunciation is much more naturally explained by the situation of Luke than by that of Matthew.

Those three events had evidently been joined together by tradition, on account of their homogeneous nature, like the two Sabbatic scenes, 6:1–11. They were examples of the discriminating wisdom with which Jesus treated the most diverse cases. This group of episodes was incorporated by the evangelists of the primitive Church in either of the traditional cycles indifferently. Accordingly, in Matthew it takes its place in the cycle of the Gadarene journey. Luke, more exact in his researches, has undoubtedly restored it to its true historical situation. For although the three events did not occur at the same time, as might appear to be the case if we were to take his narrative literally, all the three nevertheless belong to the same epoch, that of the final departure from Galilee. Holtzmann, who will have it that Matthew and Luke both borrowed this piece from the Logia, is obliged to ask why Matthew has cut off the third case? His answer is: Matthew imagined that this third personage was no other than the rich young man whose history he reckoned on giving later, in the form in which he found it in the other common source, the original Mark. Luke had not the same perspicacity; and hence he has twice related the same fact in two different forms. But the rich young man had no thought of asking Jesus to be allowed to follow Him; what filled his mind was the idea of some work to be done which would secure his salvation. The state of soul and the conversation are wholly different. At all events, if the fact was the same, it would be more natural to allow that it had taken two different forms in the tradition, and that Luke, not having the same sources as Matthew, reproduced both without suspecting their identity.

3. *The Sending of the Seventy Disciples:* 10:1–24.—Though Jesus proceeded slowly from city to city, and from village to village, He had but little time to devote to each place. It was therefore of great moment that He should everywhere find His arrival prepared for, minds awakened, hearts expectant of His visit. This precaution was the more important, because this first visit was to be His last. Accordingly, as He had sent the Twelve into the northern parts of Galilee at the period when He was visiting them for the last time, He now summons a more numerous body of His adherents to execute a similar mission in the southern regions of the province. They thus serve under His eyes, in a manner, the apprenticeship to their future calling. The recital of this mission embraces—1*st*, The Sending (vers. 1–16); 2*d*, The Return (vers. 17–24). The essential matter always is the discourse of Jesus, in which His profoundest emotions find expression.

1*st*. *The Sending*, vers. 1–16.—Ver. 1.* *The Mission.*—Ἀναδείκνυμι, *to put in*

* Ver. 1. B. L. Z. Syr^{sch}. omit καὶ. B. D. M. Syr^{cur}. It^{aliq}. Epiphanius, Augustine, Recognit. Clement.: ἑβδομήκοντο δύο. B. K. Π. some Mnn. Syr., δύο δύο instead of δύο.

view; and hence, *to elect* and *install* (1 : 80); here, *to designate.* The word *instituer* (Crampon) would wrongly give a permanent character to this mission. Schleiermacher and Meyer think that by the καὶ ἑτέρους, *others also,* Luke alludes to the sending of the two messengers (9 : 52). But those two envoys are of too widely different a nature to admit of being put on the same footing, and the term ἀνέδειξεν could not be applied to the former. The solemn instructions which follow leave no room to doubt, that by the *others also,* Luke alludes to the sending of the Twelve. The term ἑτέρους, *others,* authorizes the view that the Twelve were not comprehended in this second mission; Jesus kept them at this time by His side, with a view to their peculiar training for their future ministry.

The oscillation which prevails in the MSS. between the numbers *seventy* and *seventy-two,* and which is reproduced in ver. 17, exists equally in several other cases where this number appears, *e.g.* the seventy or seventy-two Alexandrine translators of the Old Testament. This is due to the fact that the numbers 70 and 72 are both multiples of numbers very frequently used in sacred symbolism—7 times 10 and 6 times 12. The authorities are in favor of *seventy,* the reading in particular of the *Sinaïticus.* Does this number contain an allusion to that of the members of the Sanhedrim (71, including the president)—a number which appears in its turn to correspond with that of the 70 elders chosen by Moses (Num. 11 : 16–25)? In this case it would be, so to speak, an anti-Sanhedrim which Jesus constituted, as, in naming the Twelve, He had set over against the twelve sons of Jacob twelve new spiritual patriarchs. But there is another explanation of the number which seems to us more natural. The Jews held, agreeably to Gen. 10, that the human race was made up of 70 (or 72) peoples, 14 descended from Japhet, 30 from Ham, and 26 from Shem. This idea, not uncommon in the writings of later Judaism, is thus expressed in the "Clementine Recognitions" (ii. 42): "God divided all the nations of the earth into 72 parts." If the choice of the Twelve, as it took place at the beginning, had more particular relation to Christ's mission to Israel, the sending of the seventy, carried out at a more advanced epoch, when the unbelief of the people was assuming a fixed form, announced and prepared for the extension of preaching throughout the whole earth. Jesus sent them two and two; the gifts of the one were to complete those of the other. Besides, did not the legal adage say, *In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established?* Lange translates οὗ ἔμελλεν, "where He should have come," as if the end of the visit made by the seventy had been to make up for that for which Jesus had not time. This meaning is opposed to the text, and particularly to the words *before Him.*

Vers. 2–16. *The Discourse.*—It falls into two parts: Instructions for the mission (vers. 2–12), and warnings to the cities of Galilee (vers. 13–16).

The instructions first explain the reason of this mission (ver. 2); then the conduct to be observed on setting out and during the journey (vers. 3, 4), at the time of arrival (vers. 5, 6); during their sojourn in the case of a favorable reception (vers. 7–9); finally, on their departure in the case of rejection (vers. 10–12)

Ver. 2.* "Therefore said He unto them, The harvest truly is great, but the laborers are few; pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that He would send forth laborers into His harvest." Matthew has this utterance in chap. 9, in presence of the Galilean multitudes, and as an introduction to the sending of the Twelve. Bleek

* Ver. 2. Instead of *ουν*, ℵ. B. C. D. L. Z. some Mnn. It$^{a\,ff_2\,q}$ read *δε*.

himself acknowledges that it is better placed by Luke. "The field is the world," Jesus had said in the parable of the sower. It is to this vast domain that the very strong words of this verse naturally apply, recalling the smilar words, John 4 : 35 : "Look on the fields, for they are white already to harvest," uttered in Samaria, and on the threshold, as it were, of the Gentile world. The sending of the new laborers is the fruit of the prayers of their predecessors. The prep. ἐκ in ἐκβάλλειν, *thrust forth*, may signify, forth from the Father's house, from heaven, whence real callings issue ; or, forth from the Holy Land, whence the evangelization of the Gentiles was to proceed. Following on the idea of prayer, the first meaning is the more natural.

Vers. 3, 4.* "Go your ways ; behold, I send you forth as lambs among wolves. Carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes : and salute no man by the way." They are to set out just as they are, weak and utterly unprovided. The first characteristic of the messengers of Jesus is confidence. Jesus, who gives them their mission (ἐγώ is certainly authentic), charges Himself with the task of defending them and of providing for their wants. Ὑποδήματα, *change* of sandals ; this is proved by the verb βαστάζειν, to carry a burden. It is difficult to understand the object of the last words. Are they meant to indicate haste, as in 2 Kings 4 : 29? But the journey of Jesus Himself has nothing hurried about it. Does He mean to forbid them, as some have thought, to seek the favor of men? But the words *by the way* would be superfluous. Jesus rather means that they must travel like men absorbed by one supreme interest, which will not permit them to lose their time in idle ceremonies. It is well known how complicated and tedious Eastern salutations are. The domestic hearth is the place where they are to deliver their message. A tranquillity regins there which is appropriate to so serious a subject. The following verses readily fall in with this idea.

Vers. 5, 6.† "And into whatsoever house ye enter, first say, Peace be to this house. And if the (*a*) son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon it : if not, it shall turn to you again." The pres. εἰσέρχησθε (Byz.) expresses better than the aor. (Alex.) that the entrance and the salutation are simultaneous. The prevailing impulse, in the servant of Christ, is the desire of communicating the peace with which he himself is filled (*his peace* ver. 6). If the article before υἱός—"*the* son of peace" —were authentic (T. R.), it would designate the individual as the object of a special divine decree, which is far-fetched. The phrase, *son of peace*, is a Hebraism. In this connection it represents the notion of peace as an actual force which comes to life in the individual. The reading of the two most ancient MSS., ἐπαναπαήσεται, is regular (aor. pass. ἐπάην). If no soul is found there fitted to receive the influence of the gospel salutation, it will not on that account be without efficacy ; it will return with redoubled force, as it were, on him who uttered it.

Vers. 7-9.‡ "And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give : for the laborer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house. 8. And into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you : 9. And heal the sick that are therein, and say unto them, The kingdom

* Ver. 3. ℵ. A. B. omit εγω after ιδου. Ver. 4. ℵ. B. D. L. Z. several Mnn. μη instead of μηδε.

† Ver. 5. The MSS. are divided between εισερχησθε (T. R.) and εισελθητε (Alex.). Ver. 6. T. R. reads ο before υιος, with ℵ. and some Mnn. only. ℵ. B., επαναπαησετται instead of επαναπαυσεται.

‡ Ver. 7. Εστι is omitted by ℵ. B. D. L. X. Z.

of God is come nigh unto you." A favorable reception is supposed. The messenger of Christ, regarding his entrance into that house above everything else as a providential event, is to fix his residence there during the entire period of his stay in that place (see on 9 : 4). Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ οἰκίᾳ, not "in the same house," as if it were ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ οἰκίᾳ, but, "in that same house which he entered at first." They are, besides, to regard themselves immediately as members of the family, and to eat without scruple the bread of their hosts. It is the price of their labor. They give more than they receive.

In ver. 8 Jesus applies the same principle to the whole city which shall receive them. Their arrival resembles a triumphal entrance : they are served with food ; the sick are brought to them ; they speak publicly. It is a mistake to find in the words of Paul, Πᾶν τὸ παρατιθέμενον ἐσθίετε (1 Cor. 10 . 27), an allusion to this ver. 8 ; the object of the two sayings is entirely different. There is here no question whatever as to the cleanness or uncleanness of the viands ; we are yet in a Jewish world The accus. government ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, unto (*upon*) *you*, expresses the efficacy of the message, its action upon the individuals concerned. The perf. ἤγγικε indicates that the approach of the kingdom of God is thenceforth a fact. It is near ; the presence of the messengers of the Messiah is the proof.

Vers. 10–12.* "But into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you not, go your ways out into the streets of the same and say, 11. Even the very dust of your city, which cleaveth on us, we do wipe off against you . notwithstanding be ye sure of this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. 12. But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom than for that city." This proclamation, and the symbolical act with which it closes, are solemn events ; they will play a part in the judgment of those populations. Καί, this *very* dust. The dat. ὑμῖν, *to you*, expresses the idea, "we return it to you, by shaking it from our feet." There is the breaking up of every bond of connection (see 9 : 5). Πλήν indicates, as it always does, a restriction : "Further, we have nothing else to announce to you, excepting that . . ." In spite of the bad reception, which will undoubtedly prevent the visit of Jesus, this time will nevertheless be to them the decisive epoch. Ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, *upon you*, in the T. R., is a gloss taken from ver. 9. *That day* may denote the destruction of the Jewish people by the Romans, or the last judgment. The two punishments, the one of which is more national, the other individual, are blended together in this threatening of the Lord, as in that of John the Baptist (3 : 9). Yet the idea of the last judgment seems to be the prevailing one, from what follows, ver. 14.

This threatening, wherein the full gravity of the present time is revealed, and the deep feeling expressed which Jesus had of the supreme character of His mission, leads the Lord to cast a glance backward at the conduct of the cities whose probation is now concluded, and whose sentence is no longer in suspense. The memory of the awful words which they are about to hear will follow the disciples on their mission, and will impress them with its vast importance.

Vers. 13–16.† "Woe unto thee, Chorazin ! Woe unto thee, Bethsaida ! for if the

* Ver. 10. ℵ. B. C. D. L. Z. some Mnn., εισελθητε instead of εισερχησθε. Ver. 11. ℵ. B. D. R. some Mnn. Syr$^{cur.}$ It^{plerique}, add εις τους ποδας after υμων. ℵ. B. D. L. Z. some Mnn. Syr$^{cur.}$ It^{plerique}, omit εφ υμας.

† Ver. 15. Instead of η εως ουρανου υψωθεισα, which the T. R. reads, with 16 Mjj. almost all the Mnn. Syr$^{sch.}$ It$^{alii.}$, the reading is μη εως του ουρανου υψωθησῃ

mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon which have been done in you, they had a great while ago repented, sitting in sackcloth and ashes. 14. But it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the judgment than for you. 15. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be thrust down to hell. 16. He that heareth you heareth me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me; and he that despiseth me despiseth Him that sent me." The name of Chorazin is not found either in the O. T. or in Josephus. But Jewish tradition mentions it frequently either under the name of Chorazaïm, as producing a cheese of inferior quality, or under that of Choraschin, as situated in Naphtali.*

According to Eusebius ("Onomasticon"), Chorazin was situated 12 miles (4 leagues)—Jerome says, certainly by mistake, in his translation, 2 miles—from Capernaum. This situation corresponds exactly with the ruins which still bear the name of Bir-Kirâzeh, a little to the north of Tel-Hum, if we place Capernaum in the plain of Gennesaret (p. 155).† We do not know any of the numerous miracles which this declaration implies. Of those at Bethsaida we know only one. On the important consequences which this fact has for criticism, see p. 216. The interpretation which M. Colani has attempted to give to the word δυνάμεις in this passage—works of holiness—will not bear discussion.

It is impossible to render well into English the image employed by Jesus. The two cities personified are represented as sitting clothed in sackcloth, and covered with ashes. The πλήν, *excepting*, is related to an idea which is understood: "Tyre and Sidon shall also be found guilty; only, they shall be so in a less degree than you." The tone rises (ver. 15) as the mind of Jesus turns to the city which had shared most richly in that effusion of grace of which Galilee has just been the subject—Capernaum. It was there that Jesus had fixed his residence; He had made it the new Jerusalem, the cradle of the kingdom of God. It is difficult to understand how commentators could have referred the words, *exalted to heaven*, to the commercial prosperity of the city, and Stier to its alleged situation on a hill by the side of the lake! This whole discourse of Jesus moves in the most elevated sphere. The point in question is the privilege which Jesus bestowed on the city by making it *His city* (Matt. 9 : 1). Notwithstanding the authority of Tischendorf, we unhesitatingly prefer the received reading ἡ ὑψωθεῖσα, "which art exalted," to that of some Alex., μὴ ὑψωθήσῃ, "Wilt thou be exalted? No, thou wilt come down . . ." The meaning which this reading gives is tame and insipid. It has arisen simply from the fact that the final μ of Capernaum was by mistake joined to the following ἡ, which, thus become a μή, necessitated the change from ὑψωθεῖσα to ὑψωθήσῃ. This variation is also found in Matthew, where the MSS. show another besides, ἢ ὑψώθης, which gives the same meaning as the T. R. As Heaven is here the emblem of the highest divine favors, Hades is that of the deepest abasement. In the O. T. it is the

in ℵ. B. D. L. Z. Syr^{cur}. It$^{aliq.}$ B. D. Syr^{cur}., καταβηθῃ (*thou shalt descend*) instead of καταβιβασθηθῃ (*thou shalt be cast down*). The MSS. are divided between ουρανου and του ουρανου, αδου and του αδου.

* "Tr. Menachoth," fol. 85, 1; "Baba bathra," fol. 15, 1 (see Caspari, "Chron. geogr. Einleitung in das Leben Jesu Christi," p. 76).

† Comp. Van de Velde and Felix Bovet. The latter says: "They assure me at Tiberias that there is on the mountain, at the distance of a league and a half from Tel-Hum, a ruin called Bir (*Well*) Kéresoun. This may probably be the Chorazin of the Gospel." "Voyage en Terre-Sainte," p. 415.

place of silence, where all earthly activity ceases, where all human grandeur returns to its nothingness (Ezek. 31 and 32).

Matthew places this declaration in the middle of the Galilean ministry, immediately after the embassy sent by John the Baptist. We can understand without difficulty the association of ideas which led the evangelist to connect the one of those pieces with the other. The impenitence of the people in respect of the forerunner was the prelude to their unbelief in respect of Jesus. But does not the historical situation indicated by Luke deserve the preference? Is such a denunciation not much more intelligible when the mission of Jesus to those cities was entirely finished? Luke adds a saying, ver. 16, which, by going back on the thought in the first part of the discourse, brings out its unity—the position taken up with respect to the messengers of Jesus and their preaching, shall be equivalent to a position taken up with respect to Jesus, nay, with respect to God Himself. What a grandeur, then, belongs to the work which He confides to them!

2*d. The Return:* vers. 17–24.—Jesus had appointed a rendezvous for His disciples at a fixed place. From the word *ὑπέστρεψαν, they returned* (ver. 17), it would even appear that the place was that from which He had sent them. Did He await them there, or did He in the interval take some other direction along with His apostles? The sequel will perhaps throw some light on this question. His intention certainly was Himself to visit along with them all those localities in which they had preceded Him (ver. 1). This very simple explanation sets aside all the improbabilities which have been imputed to this narrative. The return of the disciples was signalized, first of all, by a conversation of Jesus with them about their mission (vers. 17–20); then by an outburst, unique in the life of the Saviour, regarding the unexpected but marvellous progress of His work (vers. 21–24).

Vers. 17–20.* *The Joy of the Disciples.*—"And the seventy returned again with joy, saying, Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through Thy name. 18. And He said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven. 19. Behold, I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy: and nothing shall by any means hurt you. 20. Only in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you; but rejoice because your names are written in heaven." The phrase, *with joy*, expresses the tone of the whole piece. The joy of the disciples becomes afterward that of Jesus; and then it bursts forth from His heart exalted and purified (ver. 21, *et seq.*). Confident in the promise of their Master, they had set themselves to heal the sick, and in this way they had soon come to attack the severest malady of all—that of possession; and they had succeeded. Their surprise at this unhoped-for success is described, with the vivacity of an entirely fresh experience by the *καί*, "*even* the devils," and by the pres. *ὑποτάσσεται, submit themselves.* The word *ἐθεώρουν, I was contemplating*, denotes an intuition, not a vision. Jesus does not appear to have had visions after that of His baptism. The two acts which the imperfect *I was contemplating* shows to be simultaneous, are evidently that informal perception, and the triumphs of the disciples recorded in ver. 17: "While you were expelling the subordinates, I was seeing the master fall." On

* Ver. 17. B. D. It$^{\text{aliq.}}$ add *δυο* after *εβδομηκοντα*. Ver. 19. ℵ. B. C. L. X. some Mnn. Vss. and Fathers, *δεδωκα* in place of *διδωμι*, which is the reading of 15 Mjj. the most of the Mnn. Syr. Justin, Ir. Ver. 20. The *μαλλον* which the T. R. reads after *χαιρετε δε* is supported only by X. and some Mnn. ℵ. B. L. X., *εγγεγραπται* instead of *εγραφη*.

the external scene, the representatives on both sides were struggling in the inmost consciousness of Jesus, it was the two chiefs that were face to face. The fall of Satan which He contemplates, symbolizes the complete destruction of his kingdom, the goal of that work which is inaugurated by the present successes of the disciples; Comp. John 12 : 31. Now the grand work of Satan on the earth, according to Scripture, is idolatry. Paganism throughout is nothing else than a diabolical enchantment. It has been not unjustly called *une possession en grande.** Satan sets himself up as the object of human adoration. As the ambitious experience satisfaction in the incense of glory, so he finds the savor of the same in all those impure worships, which are in reality addressed to himself (1 Cor. 10 : 20). There remains nevertheless a great difference between the scriptural view of Paganism and the opinion prevalent among the Jews, according to which *every* Pagan divinity was a separate demon. *Heaven* denotes here, like ἐν ἐπουρανίοις, Eph. 6 : 12, the higher sphere from the midst of which Satan acts upon human consciousness. *To fall from heaven*, is to lose this state of power. The figure used by our Lord thus represents the overthrow of idolatry throughout the whole world. The aor. πεσόντα, *falling*, denotes, under the form of a single act, all the victories of the gospel over Paganism from that first preaching of the disciples down to the final *dénouement* of the great drama (Rev. 12). The figure *lightening* admirably depicts a power of dazzling brilliance, which is suddenly extinguished. This description of the destruction of Paganism, as the certain goal of the work begun by this mission of the disciples, confirms the *universalism* which we ascribed to the number 70, to the idea of harvest, ver. 2, and in general to this whole piece. Hofmann refers the word of Jesus, ver. 18, to the devil's original fall; Lange, to his defeat in the wilderness. These explanations proceed from a misunderstanding of the context.

Ver. 19. If we admit the Alex. reading, δέδωκα, *I have given you*, Jesus leads His disciples to measure what they had not at first apprehended—the full extent of the power with which He has invested them; and ἰδού, *behold*, relates to the surprise which should be raised in them by this revelation. He would thus give them the key to the unhoped-for successes which they have just won. The pres. δίδωμι in the T. R. relates to the future. It denotes a new extension of powers in view of a work more considerable still than that which they have just accomplished, precisely that which Jesus has described symbolically, ver. 18; and ἰδού expresses the astonishment which they might well feel at the yet more elevated perspective. Thus understood, the sentence is much more significant. Serpents and scorpions are emblems of the physical evils by which Satan will seek to hurt the ambassadors of Jesus. The expression, *all the power of the enemy*, embraces all the agencies of nature, of human society, of things belonging to the spiritual order, which the prince of this world can use to obstruct the work of Jesus. Ἐπί is dependent on ἐξουσίαν rather than on πατεῖν (9 : 1). In the midst of all those diabolical instruments, the faithful servant walks clothed with invulnerable armor; not that he is not sometimes subjected to their attacks, but the wounds which he receives cannot hurt him so long as the Lord has need of his ministry (the viper at Malta, Peter's imprisonment by Herod, the messenger of Satan which buffets Paul). The same thought, with a slight difference of expression, is found Mark 16 : 18; comp. also Ps. 91 : 13.

Ver. 20. Yet this victory over the forces of the enemy would be of no value to

* M. A. Nicolas.

themselves, if it did not rest on their personal salvation. Think of Judas, and of those who are spoken of in Matt. 7 : 22, *et seq.* ! Πλήν, *only*, reserves a truth more important than that which Jesus has just allowed. The word μᾶλλον, "*rather* rejoice," which the T. R. reads, and which is found in the Sinaït., weakens the thought of Jesus. There is no limitation to the truth, that the most magnificent successes, the finest effects of eloquence, temples filled, conversions by thousands, are no real cause of joy to the servant of Jesus, the instrument of those works, except in so far as he is saved himself. From the personal point of view (which is that of the joy of the disciples at the moment), this ground of satisfaction is and remains the only one. The figure of a heavenly register, in which the names of the elect are inscribed, is common in the Old Testament (Ex. 32 : 32, 33 ; Isa. 4 : 3 ; Dan. 12 : 1). This book is the type of the divine decree. But a name may be blotted out of it (Ex. 32 : 33 ; Jer. 17 : 13 ; Ps. 69 : 29 ; Rev. 22 : 19) ; a fact which preserves human freedom. Between the two readings, ἐγγέγραπται, *is inscribed*, and ἐγράφη, *was written*, it is difficult to decide.

Vers. 21–24. *The Joy of Jesus.*—We reach a point in the life of the Saviour, the exceptional character of which is expressly indicated by the first words of the narrative, *in that same hour*. Jesus has traced to their goal the lines of which His disciples discern as yet only the beginning. He has seen in spirit the work of Satan destroyed, the structure of the kingdom of God raised on the earth. But by what hands? By the hands of those ignorant fishermen, those simple rustics whom the powerful and learned of Jerusalem call accursed rabble (John 7 : 49), "the vermin of the earth" (a rabbinical expression). Perhaps Jesus had often meditated on the problem : How shall a work be able to succeed which does not obtain the assistance of any of the men of knowledge and authority in Israel? The success of the mission of the seventy has just brought Him the answer of God : it is by the meanest instruments that He is to accomplish the greatest of His works. In this arrangement, so contrary to human anticipations, Jesus recognizes and adores with an overflowing heart the wisdom of His Father.

Vers. 21, 22.* "In that same hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I praise Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes : even so, Father ; for so it seemed good in Thy sight. 22. All things are delivered to me of my Father : and no one knoweth who the Son is, but the Father ; and who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal Him." The πνεῦμα, *the spirit*, which is here spoken of, is undoubtedly that of Jesus Himself, as an element of His human Person (1 Thess. 5 : 23 ; Heb. 4 : 12 ; Rom. 1 : 9). The spirit, in this sense, is in man the boundless capacity of receiving the communications of the Divine Spirit, and consequently the seat of all those emotions which have God and the things of God for their object (see on 1 : 47). We think it necessary to read τῷ πνεύματι as *dat. instr.*, and that the addition of τῷ ἁγίῳ (*the holy*) and of the prep. ἐν in some mss. arises from the false application of this expression to the Spirit of God. Ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι, *to exult*, denotes an inner transport, which takes place in the same deep

* Ver. 21. The mss. are divided between εν τω πνευματι and τω πνευματι. ℵ. B. D Z. Syr$^{cur.}$ It$^{aliq.}$ reject ο Ιησους after πνευματι, and add τω αγιω, with 5 other Mjj. some Mnn. Syr$^{sch.}$ Ver. 22. 14 Mjj. the most of the Mnn. Syr$^{sch.}$ It$^{aliq.}$ here add the words, και στραφεις προς τους μαθητας ειπεν, which are omitted by T. R. with ℵ. B. D. L. M. Z. π. some Mnn. Syr$^{cur.}$ It^{plerique}.

regions of the soul of Jesus as the opposite emotion expressed by the ἐμβριμᾶσθαι, *to groan* (John 11 : 33). This powerful influence of external events on the inner being of Jesus proves how thoroughly in earnest the Gospels take His humanity. Ἐξομολογεῖσθαι, strictly, *to declare, confess*, corresponds in the LXX. to הודה, *to praise*. Here it expresses a joyful and confident acquiescence in the ways of God. The words *Father* and *Lord* indicate, the former the special love of which Jesus feels Himself to be the object in the dispensation which He celebrates, the latter the glorious sovereignty in virtue of which God dispenses with all human conditions of success, and looks for it only from His own power. The close of this verse has been explained in this way : "that while Thou hast hid . . . Thou hast revealed . . ." The giving of thanks would thus be limited to the second fact. Comp. a similar form, Isa. 50 : 2, Rom. 6 : 17. But we doubt that this is to impair the depth of our Lord's thought. Did not God, in the way in which He was guiding the work of Jesus (in Israel), wish quite as positively the exclusion of the wise as the co-operation of the ignorant? The motive for this divine method is apparent from 1 Cor. 1 : 23–31, in particular from vers. 29 and 31 : "that no flesh should glory ;" and, "that he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." By this rejection the great are humbled, and see that they are not needed for God's work. On the other hand, the mean cannot boast of their co-operation, since it is evident that they have derived nothing from themselves. We may compare the saying of Jesus regarding the old and the new bottles (vers. 37, 38). The wise were not to mingle the alloy of their own science with the divine wisdom of the gospel. Jesus required instruments prepared exclusively in His own school, and having no other wisdom than that which He had communicated to them from His Father (John 17 : 8). When He took a learned man for an apostle, He required, before employing him, to break him as it were, by the experience of his folly. Jesus, in that hour of holy joy, takes account more definitely of the excellence of this divine procedure ; and it is while contemplating its first effects that His heart exults and adores. "L'événement capital de l'histoire du monde,"* carried out by people who had scarcely a standing in the human race! Comp. John 9 : 39. The ναί, "yea, Father," reasserts strongly the acquiescence of Jesus in this paradoxical course. Instead of the nom. ὁ πατήρ, *Father*, it might be thought that he would have used the voc. πάτερ, O Father! as at the beginning of the verse. But the address does not need to be repeated. The nom. has another meaning : "It is as *a Father* that Thou art acting in thus directing my work." The ὅτι, *for that* or *because*, which follows, is usually referred to an idea which is understood ; "yea, it is so, because . . ." But this ellipsis would be tame. It would be better in that case to supply the notion of a prayer : "Yea, let it be and remain so, since . . . !" But is it not more simple to take ὅτι as depending on ἐξομολογοῦμαι : "yea, assuredly, and in spite of all, I praise Thee, because that . . ." The phrase εὐδοκία ἔμπρ. σου is a Hebraism (לרעון לפני יהוה, Ex. 28 : 38). Gess thus sums up the thought of this verse : "To pride of knowledge, blindness is the answer ; to that simplicity of heart which wishes truth, revelation."

Ver. 22. The words, *And He turned Him unto His disciples*, which are read here by several Mjj., are in vain defended by Tischendorf and Meyer. They are not authentic. How indeed could we understand this στραφείς, *having turned Himself?* Turned, Meyer explains, turned from His Father, to whom He has been praying,

* Rénan, "Vie de Jésus," p. 1.

toward men. But would the phrase *turn Himself back* be suitable in this sense? We have here a gloss occasioned by the κατ' ἰδίαν, *privately*, of ver. 23. The wish has to been to establish a difference between this first revelation, made to the disciples in general (ver. 22), and the following, more special still, addressed to some of them only (ver. 23). Here we have one of the rare instances in which the T. R. (which rejects the words) differs from the third edition of Steph.

The joyful outburst of ver. 21 is carried on without interruption into ver. 22; only the first impression of adoration gives way to calm meditation. The experience through which Jesus has just passed has transported Him, as it were, into the bosom of His Father. He plunges into it, and His words become an echo of the joys of His eternal generation.

As in the passage which precedes (ver. 21), and in that which follows (22*b*), it is only knowledge which is spoken of, the words, "All things are delivered to me of my Father," are often taken as referring to the possession and communication of religious truths, of the knowledge of God. But the work accomplished by the disciples, on occasion of which Jesus uttered those sayings, was not merely a work of teaching—there was necessarily involved in it a display of force. To overturn the throne of Satan on the earth, and to put in its place the kingdom of God, was a mission demanding a power of action. But this power was closely connected with the knowledge of God. To know God means to be initiated into His plan; means to think with Him, and consequently to will as He does. Now, to will with God, and to be self-consecrated to Him as an instrument in His service, is the secret of participation in His omnipotence. "The education of souls," Gess rightly observes, "is the greatest of the works of Omnipotence." Everything in the universe, accordingly, should be subordinate to it. There is a strong resemblance between this saying of Jesus and that of John the Baptist (John 3 : 35): "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into His hand"—a declaration which is immediately connected with the other relative to the teaching of Jesus: "He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God."

The gift denoted by the aor. παρεδόθη, *are delivered to me*, is the subject of an eternal decree; but it is realized progressively in time, like everything which is subject to the conditions of human development. The chief periods in its realization are these three: The coming of Jesus into the world, His entrance upon His Messianic ministry, and His restoration to His divine state. Such are the steps by which the new Master took the place of the old (4 : 6), and was raised to Omnipotence. "Delivered," Gess well observes, "either for salvation or for judgment." The καί, *and*, which connects the two parts of the verse, may be thus paraphrased: *and that, because* . . . The future conquest of the world by Jesus and His disciples rests on the relation which He sustains to God, and with which He identifies His people. The perfect knowledge of God is, in the end, the sceptre of the universe. Here there is a remarkable difference in compiling between Luke and Matthew: οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει, no one *recognizes*, or discerns, says Matthew. To the idea of knowing, this ἐπι (to put the finger *upon*) has the effect of adding the idea of confirming experimentally. The knowledge in question is one *de visu*. Luke uses the simple verb γινώσκειν, *to know*, which is weaker and less precise; but he makes up for this deficiency in the notion of the verb by amplifying its regimen. "What is the Father . . . what is the Son:" that is to say, all that God is as a Father to the man who has the happiness of knowing Him as a son, and all that the name son includes for

the man who has the happiness of hearing it pronounced by the mouth of the Father —all that the Father and Son are the one to the other. Perhaps Matthew's form of expression is a shade more intellectual or didactic ; that of Luke rather moves in the sphere of feeling. How should we explain the two forms, each of which is evidently independent of the other? Jesus must have employed in Aramaic the verb ידע, *to know*.* Now ידע is construed either with the accusative or with one of the two prepositions ב, *in*, or על, *upon*. The construction with one or other of these prepositions adds something to the notion of the verb. For example, שמע, *to hear;* שמע ל, *to listen ;* שמע ב, to listen *with acquiescence of heart*. There is a similar difference of meaning between ידע and ידע ב or ידע על—a difference analogous to that between the two expressions, *rem cognoscere* and *cognoscere de re*, to know *a thing* and to know *of a thing*. Thus, in the passage in Job 37 : 16, where ידע is construed with על, *upon*, the sense is not, "Knowest thou balancings of the clouds?"—Job could not but have known the fact which falls under our eyes—but "Understandest thou the . . ?" Now if we suppose that Jesus used the verb ידע with one of the prepositions ב or ל, the two Greek forms may be explained as two different attempts to render the entire fulness of the Aramaic expression ; that of Matthew strengthening the notion of the simple verb by the preposition ἐπί (*re*cognize) (which would correspond more literally with ידע על) ; that of Luke, by giving greater fulness to the idea of the object, by means of the paraphrase τίς ἐστιν, *what is*.†

A remarkable example, 9 : 3, has already shown how differences of matter and form in the reproduction of the words of Jesus by our evangelists are sometimes explained with the utmost ease by going back to the Hebrew or Aramaic text.‡ What a proof of the authenticity of those discourses ! What a proof also of the independence of our several Greek digests !

That exclusive knowledge which the Father and Son have of one another is evidently not *the cause* of their paternal and filial relation ; on the contrary, it is *the effect* of it. Jesus is not the *Son* because He alone perfectly knows the Father, and is fully known only by Him ; but He knows Him and is known by Him in this way only because He is *the Son*. In like manner, God is not *the Father* because He alone knows the Son, and is known only by Him ; but this double knowledge is the effect of that paternal relation which He sustains to the Son. The article before the two substantives serves to raise this unique relation above the relative temporal order of things, and to put it in the sphere of the absolute, in the very essence of the two Beings. God did not become Father at an hour marked on some earthly dial. If He is a Father to certain beings born in time, it is because He is *the Father* absolutely—that is to say, in relation to a Being who is not born in time, and who is toward Him the Son as absolutely. Such is the explanation of the difficult verse, Eph. 3 : 15. Mark, who has not the passage, gives another wherein the term *the*

* I owe the following observations to the kindness of M. Felix Bovet.

† In the passage quoted from Job, the two principal German translations present a remarkable parallel. De Wette : Weisst du um . . ? Ewald : Verstehs du. . ? Both have thoroughly apprehended the sense of the original expression ; each has sought to reproduce it in his own way.

‡ Many other similar examples might be cited, *e.g.* Luke 6 : 20. If Jesus said עניים we can explain both the brief πτωχοί of Luke as a literal translation *ad sensum* (according to the known shade which the meaning of עני bears throughout the Old Testament).

Son is used in the same absolute sense, 13 : 32 : "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, *neither the Son*, but the Father." After words like these, we cannot admit any radical difference between the Jesus of the Synoptics and that of John.* The existence of the Son belonging to the essence of the Father, the pre-existence of the one is implied in the eternity of the other.

Immediate knowledge of the Father is the exclusive privilege of the Son. But it becomes the portion of believers as soon as He initiates them into the contents of His filial consciousness, and consents to share it with them. By this participation in the consciousness of the Son (the work of the Holy Spirit), the believer in his turn attains to the intuitive knowledge of the Father. Comp. John 1 : 18, 14 : 6, 17 : 26. With Gess, we ought to remark the importance of the priority given to the knowledge of the Son by the Father over that of the Father by the Son. Were the order inverted, the gift of all things, the παραδίδοναι, would have appeared to rest on the religious instruction which Jesus had been giving to men. The actual order makes it the consequence of the unsearchable relation between Jesus and the Father, in virtue of which He can be to souls everything that the Father Himself is to them. This passage (vers. 21, 22) is placed by Matthew, chap. 11, after the denunciation pronounced on the Galilean cities, and immediately following on the deputation of John the Baptist. We cannot comprehend those of our critics, Gess included, who prefer this situation to that of Luke. Gess thinks that the disciples (10 : 21) are contrasted with the unbelieving Galilean cities. But the whole passage refers to the disciples as *instruments* in God's work ; and Jesus contrasts them not with the ignorant Galileans, but with the *wise* of Jerusalem. See Matthew even, ver. 25. As to the following sentence, ver. 22, Gess thinks that he can paraphrase it thus : "No man, *not even John the Baptist*, knoweth the Son . . . " in order thus to connect it with the account of the forerunner's embassy, which forms the preceding context in Matthew. But in relation to the preceding verse the word *no man* alludes not to John, but to the *wise* and learned of Jerusalem, who pretended that they alone had the knowledge of God (11 : 52). It is not difficult, then, to perceive the superiority of Luke's context ; and we may prove here, as everywhere else, the process of concatenation, in

* M. Réville has found out a way of getting rid of our passage. Jesus, he will have it, said one day in a melancholy tone : "God alone reads my heart to its depths, and I alone also know God." And this "perfectly natural" thought, "under the influence of a later theology," took the form in which we find it here ("Hist. du Dogme de la Div. de J. C." p. 17). M. Réville finds a confirmation of his hypothesis in the fact that in their present form the words strangely break the thread of the discourse. We think that we have shown their relation to the situation in general, and to the preceding context in particular. And the searching study of the relations between Luke's form and that of Matthew has led us up to a Hebrew formula necessarily anterior to all "later theology." One must have an exegetical conscience of rare elasticity to be able to find rest by means of such expedients. M. Rénan having no hope of *evacuating* the words of their real contents, simply sets them down as a later interpolation : "Matt. 11 : 27 and Luke 10 : 22 represent in the synoptic system a late interpolation in keeping with the type of the Johannine discourses." But what ! an interpolation simultaneously in the two writings ? in two different contexts ? in all the manuscripts and in all the versions ? and with the differences which we have established and explained by the Aramaic ? Let us take an example : The doxology interpolated in Matthew (6 : 13), at the end of the Lord's prayer. It is wanting in very many MSS. and Vss., and is not found in the parallel passage in Luke. Such are the evidences of a real interpolation.

virtue of which we find different elements united together in Matt 11 : 7–30 by a simple association of ideas in the mind of the compiler.

With the last words of ver. 22, *and he to whom the Son will reveal Him*, the thought of Jesus reverts to His disciples who surround Him, and in whom there is produced at this very time the beginning of the promised illumination. He now addresses Himself *to them*. The meditation of ver. 22 is the transition between the adoration of ver. 21 and the congratulation which follows.

Vers. 23 and 24,* "And He turned Him unto His disciples, and said privately, Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see : 24. For I tell you, that many prophets and kings have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them ; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them." Elevated as was the conception which the disciples had of the person and work of Jesus, they were far from appreciating at its full value the fact of His appearance, and the privilege of being the agents of such a Master. At this solemn hour Jesus seeks to open their eyes. But He cannot express Himself publicly on the subject. It is, as it were, in an undertone that He makes this revelation to them, vers. 23 and 24. This last sentence admirably finishes the piece. We find it in Matthew, chap. 13, applied to the new mode of teaching which Jesus had just employed by making use of the form of parables. The expression, *those things which ye see*, is incompatible with this application, which is thus swept away by the text of Matthew himself. Luke here omits the beautiful passage with which Matthew (11 : 28–30) closes this discourse : "*Come unto me . . .*" If he had known such words, would he have omitted them ? Is not this invitation in the most perfect harmony with the spirit of his gospel ? Holtzmann, who feels how much the theory of the employment of a common source is compromised by this omission, endeavors to explain it. He supposes that Luke, as a good Paulinist, must have taken offence at the word ταπεινός, *humble*, when applied to Christ, as well as at the terms *yoke* and *burden*, which recalled the law too strongly. And it is in face of Luke 22 : 27, "I am among you *as he that serveth* . . ." and of 16 : 17, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail . . ." that such reasons are advanced ! His extremity here drives Holtzmann to use one of those Tübingen processes which he himself combats throughout his whole book.

Modern criticism denies the historical character of this second mission. It is nothing more, Baur alleges, than an invention of Luke to lower the mission of the Twelve, and to exalt that of Paul and his assistants, of whom our seventy are provided as the precursors. With what satisfaction does not this Luke, who is silent as to the effects of the sending of the Twelve, describe those of the present mission ! He goes the length of applying to the latter, and that designedly, part of the instructions which Jesus had given (Matt. 10) in regard to the former ! Besides, the other Gospels nowhere mention those seventy evangelists whose mission Luke is pleased to relate ! Holtzmann, who likewise denies the historical character of the narrative, does not, however, ascribe to Luke any deliberate fraud. The explanation of the matter is, according to him, a purely literary one. Of the two sources which Matthew and Luke consulted, the former—that is, the original Mark—recorded the sending of the Twelve with a few brief instructions, such as we have found in Luke 9 : 1–6 and Mark 6 : 7–13 ; the second, the *Logia*, contained the full and detailed discourse which Jesus must have delivered on the occasion, as we read it Matt. 10. The author of our first Gospel saw that the discourse of the *Logia* applied to the sending of the Twelve mentioned in the original Mark, and attached it thereto. Luke

* Ver. 23. D. Syr^{cur}. It^{plerique}, Vg. omit κατ' ιδιαν.

had not the same perspicacity. After having related the mission of the Twelve (9 : 1–6) after the proto-Mark, he found the great discourse in the *Logia;* and to get a suitable place for it, he thought that he must create a situation at his own hand. With this view, but without the least purpose of a dogmatic kind, he imagined a second mission, that of the seventy.

But if the origin of this narrative were as Baur supposes, how should only the Twelve reappear later in the Gospel of Luke (17 : 5, 18 : 31), without ever a word more of those seventy? How should Luke in the Acts make no mention of those latter? Was it not easy and natural, after having *invented* them, to give them a part to play in the mission organized under Paul's direction? An author does not lie in good earnest, only to forget thereafter to make use of his fraud. We have found that, as to the mission of the Twelve, Luke says at least (9 : 10), "And the apostles, when they were returned, told Him, all that they had done" (remark the ὅσα, stronger than the simple ἃ); while Matthew, after the discourse, adds not a single word about the mission and its results! In short, the narrative of the sending of the seventy is so far from being a Paulinist invention, that in a work of the second century, proceeding from the sect most hostile to Paul, we find the following passage put in the mouth of Peter ("Recognit. Clem.," i. 24): "He first chose us twelve, whom He called apostles; then He chose seventy-two other disciples from among the most faithful." The old historians have undoubtedly been somewhat arbitrary in numbering among those seventy many persons whom they designate as having formed part of them. But this false application proves nothing against the fact itself; on the contrary, it attests the impression which the Church had of its reality.

The opinion of Holtzmann would charge the sacred historian with an arbitrariness incompatible with the serious love of historical truth which is expressed, according to Holtzmann himself, in his introduction. Besides we shall see (17 : 1–10) how entirely foreign such procedure was to the mind of Luke. When, finally, we consider the internal perfection of his whole narrative, the admirable correspondence between the emotions of our Lord and the historical event which gives rise to them, have we not a sufficient guarantee for the reality of this episode? As the account of the healing of the lunatic child is the masterpiece of Mark, this description of the sending of the seventy disciples is the pearl of Luke.

4. *The Conversation with the Scribe, and the Parable of the Samaritan:* 10 : 25–37. —Jesus slowly continues His journey, stopping at each locality. The most varied scenes follow one another without internal relation, and as circumstances bring them. Weizsäcker, starting from the assumption that this framework is not historical, has set himself to seek a systematic plan, and affects to find throughout an order according to subjects. Thus he would have the parable of the good Samaritan connected with the sending of the seventy by its object, which was originally to prove the right of the evangelists, to whatever nationality they might belong. But where in the parable is there to be found the least trace of correspondence between the work done by the good Samaritan and the function of the evangelists in the apostolic church? How could the original tendency fail to come out at some point of the description? Holtzmann thinks that in what follows Luke conjoins two distinct accounts—that of the scribe (vers. 25–28), which we find in Mark 12 : 28 and Matt. 22 : 35, and the parable of the good Samaritan taken from the Logia. The connection which our Gospel establishes between the two events (ver. 29) is nothing else than a rather unskilful combination on the part of Luke. But there is no proof that the scribe of Luke is the same as that spoken of by Mark and Matthew. It is at Jerusalem, and in the days which precede the passion, that this latter appears; and above all, as Meyer acknowledges, the matter of discussion is entirely different. The scribe of Jerusalem asks Jesus which is the greatest commandment. His is a theological question. That of Galilee, like the rich young man, desires Jesus to point out to him the means of salvation. His is a practical question. Was there but one Rabbin in Israel who could

enter into discussion with Jesus on such subjects? It is possible, no doubt, that some external details belonging to one of those scenes got mixed up in tradition with the narrative of the other. But the moral contents form the essential matter, and they are too diverse to admit of being identified. As to the connection which ver. 29 establishes between the interview and the parable which follows, it is confirmed by the lesson which flows from the parable (vers. 36, 37), and about the authenticity of which there is no doubt.

Vers. 25–28.* *The Work which saves.*—In Greece the object of search is truth; in Israel it is salvation. So this same question is found again in the mouth of the rich young man. The expression *stood up* shows that Jesus and the persons who surrounded Him were seated. Several critics think this "scenery" (Holtzmann) inconsistent with the idea of a journey, as if we had not to do here with a course of preaching, and as if Jesus must have been, during the weeks this journey lasts, constantly on His feet! The *test* to which the scribe wished to subject Jesus bore either on His orthodoxy or on His theological ability. His question rests on the idea of the merit of works. Strictly, *on having done what work shall I certainly inherit . . .?* In the term *to inherit* there is an allusion to the possession of the land of Canaan, which the children of Israel had received as a heritage from the hand of God, and which to the Jewish mind continued to be the type of the Messianic blessedness. The question of Jesus distinguishes between the contents (τί) and the text (πῶς) of the law. It has been thought that, while saying, *How readest thou?* Jesus pointed to the phylactery attached to the scribe's dress, and on which passages of the law were written. But at ver. 28 we should find *thou hast well read*, instead of *thou hast answered right*. And it cannot be proved that those two passages were united on the phylacteries. The first alone appears to have figured on them.

It is not wonderful that the scribe instantly quotes the first part of the summary of the law, taken from Deut. 6:5; for the Jews were required to repeat this sentence morning and evening. As to the second, taken from Lev. 19:18, we may doubt whether he had the readiness of mind to join it immediately with the first, and so to compose this magnificent *resumé* of the substance of the law. In Mark 12 and Matt. 22 it is Jesus Himself who unites those two utterances. It is probable, as Bleek thinks, that Jesus guided the scribe by a few questions to formulate this answer. Ver. 26 has all the appearance of the opening of a catechetical course. The first part of the summary includes four terms; in Hebrew there are only three—לֵב, *heart;* נֶפֶשׁ, *soul;* מְאֹד, *might*. The LXX. also have only three, but they translate לֵב, *heart*, by διανοία, *mind*; and this is the word which appears in Luke as the fourth term. In Matthew there are three: διανοία is the last; in Mark, four: σύνεσις takes the place of διανοία, and is put second. Καρδία, *the heart*, in Mark and Luke is foremost; it is the most general term: it denotes in Scripture the central *focus* from which all the rays of the moral life go forth; and that in their three principal directions—the powers of feeling, or the affections, נֶפֶשׁ, *the soul*, in the sense of feeling; the active powers, the impulsive aspirations, מְאֹד, the *might*, the will; and the intellectual powers, analytical or contemplative, διανοία, *mind*. The difference between the heart, which resembles the trunk, and the three branches, feeling, will, and understanding, is emphatically marked, in the Alex. variation, by the substitu-

* Ver. 27. א. B. D. Δ. Z. some Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ read, εν ολη τη ψυχη, εν ολη τη ισχυει, εν ολη τη διανοια, instead of εξ with the genitive.

tion of the preposition ἐν, *in*, for ἐκ, *with* (from), in the three last members. Moral life proceeds *from* the heart, and manifests itself without, *in* the three forms of activity indicated. The impulse Godward proceeds *from* the heart, and is realized in the life *through* the affection, which feeds on that supreme object; *through* the will, which consecrates itself actively to the accomplishment of His will; and *through* the mind, which pursues the track of His thoughts, in all His works. The second part of the summary is the corollary of the first, and cannot be realized except in connection with it. Nothing but the reigning love of God can so divest the individual of devotion to his own person, that the ego of his neighbor shall rank in his eyes exactly on the same level as his own. The pattern must be loved above all, if the image in others is to appear to us as worthy of esteem and love as in ourselves. Thus to love is, as Jesus says, the path to life, or rather it is life itself. God has no higher life than that of love. The answer of Jesus is therefore not a simple accommodation to the legal point of view. The work which saves, or salvation, is really loving. The gospel does not differ from the law in its aim; it is distinguished from it only by its indication of means and the communication of strength.

Vers. 29–37. *The good Samaritan.*—How is such love to be attained? This would have been the question put by the scribe, had he been in the state of soul which Paul describes Rom. 7, and which is the normal preparation for faith. He would have confessed his impotence, and repeated the question in a yet deeper sense than at the beginning of the interview: What shall I do? What shall I do in order to love thus? But instead of that, feeling himself condemned by the holiness of the law which he has himself formally expressed, he takes advantage of his ignorance, in other words, of the obscurity of the letter of the law, to excuse himself for not having observed it: "What does the word neighbor mean? How far does its application reach?" So long as one does not know exactly what this expression signifies, it is quite impossible, he means, to fulfil the commandment. Thus the remark of Luke, "willing *to justify* himself," finds an explanation which is perfectly natural. The real aim of the parable of the good Samaritan is to show the scribe that the answer to the theological question, which he thinks good to propose, is written by nature on every right heart, and that to know, nothing is needed but the *will* to understand it. But Jesus does not at all mean thereby that it is by his charitable disposition, or by this solitary act of kindness, that the Samaritan can obtain salvation. We must not forget that a totally new question, that of the *meaning* of the word neighbor, has intervened. It is to the latter question that Jesus replies by the parable. He lets the scribe understand that this question, proposed by him as so difficult, is resolved by a right heart, without its ever proposing it at all. This ignorant Samaritan naturally (φύσει, Rom. 2 : 14) possessed the light which the Rabbins had not found, or had lost, in their theological lucubrations. Thus was condemned the excuse which he had dared to advance. May we not suppose it is from sayings such as this that Paul has derived his teaching regarding the *law written in the heart*, and regarding its partial observance by the Gentiles, Rom. 2 : 14–16?

Vers. 29–32.* *The Priest and the Levite.*—Lightfoot has proved that the Rabbins did not, in general, regard as their neighbors those who were not members of the

* Ver. 29. The MSS. are divided between δικαιουν (T. R.) and δικαιωσαι (Alex.). Ver. 30. E. G. H. T. V. Δ. Λ. several Mnn. Ital.q. Vg., εξεδυσαν instead of εκδυσαντες. ℵ. B. D. L. Z. some Mnn. omit τυγχανοντα. Ver. 32. ℵ*. B. L. X. Z. omit γενομενος. ℵ. D. Γ. Δ. several Mnn. Vss. read αυτον after ιδων.

P. J. LIBRARY K. C. K. BAPTIST SEMINARY

Jewish nation. Perhaps the subject afforded matter for learned debates in their schools. The word πλήσιον, being without article here, might be taken in strictness as an adverb. It is simpler to regard it as the well-known substantive ὁ πλήσιον. The καί, *and*, introducing the answer, brings it into relation with the preceding question which called it forth. The word ὑπολαβών, *rejoining*, which does not occur again in the N. T., is put for the ordinary term ἀποκριθείς, *answering*, to give more gravity to what follows. The mountainous, and for the most part desert country, traversed by the road from Jerusalem to Jericho, was far from safe. Jerome (*ad Jerem.* 3 : 2) relates that in his time it was infested by hordes of Arabs. The distance between the two cities is seven leagues. The καί, *also*, before ἐκδύσαντες, ver. 30, supposes a first act which is self-understood, the relieving him of his purse. There is a sort of irony in the κατὰ συγκυρίαν, *by chance*. It is certainly not by accident that the narrator brings those two personages on the scene. The preposition ἀντί in ἀντιπαρῆλθε, *he passed by*, might denote a curve made in an opposite direction ; but it is simpler to understand it in the sense of *over against*. In view of such a spectacle, they pass on. Comp. the antithesis προσελθών, *having gone to him*, ver. 34.

Vers. 33-35.* *The Samaritan.*—For the sake of contrast, Jesus chooses a Samaritan, a member of that half Gentile people who were separated from the Jews by an old national hatred. In the matter about which priests are ignorant, about which the scribe is still disputing, this simple and right heart sees clearly at the first glance. His neighbor is the human being, whoever he may be, with whom God brings him into contact, and who has need of his help. The term ὁδεύων, *as he journeyed*, conveys the idea that he might easily have thought himself excused from the duty of compassion toward this stranger In every detail of the picture, ver. 34, there breathes the most tender pity (ἐσπλαγχνίσθη). Oil and wine always formed part of the provision for a journey. We see from what follows that πανδοχεῖον signifies not a simple caravansary, but a real inn, where people were received for payment. Ἐπί, ver. 35, should be understood as in Acts 3 : 1 : *Toward* the morrow, that is to say, at daybreak. The term ἐξελθών, *when he departed*, shows that he was now on horseback, ready to go. Two pence are equal to about 1*s* 4*d*. After having brought the wounded man the length of the hostelry, he might have regarded himself as discharged from all responsibility in regard to him, and given him over to the care of his own countrymen, saying : " He is your neighbor rather than mine." But the compassion which constrained him to begin, obliges him to finish. What a masterpiece is this portrait ! What a painter was its author, and what a narrator was he who has thus transmitted it to us, undoubtedly in all its original freshness !

Vers. 36, 37.† *The Moral.*—The question with which Jesus obliges the scribe to make application of the parable may seem badly put. According to the theme of discussion : " Who is my neighbor ?" (ver. 29), it would seem that He should have asked : Whom, then, wilt thou regard as thy neighbor to guide thee to him, as the Samaritan was guided to thy compatriot ? But as the term neighbor implies the idea of reciprocity, Jesus has the right of reversing the expressions, and He does so not without reason. Is it not more effective to ask : By whom should I like to be suc-

* Ver. 33. ℵ. B. L. Z. 3 Mnn. omit αυτον after ιδων. Ver. 35. ℵ. B. D. L. X. Z s me Mnn. Syr. It. omit εξελθων. B. D. L. Z. some Mnn. Syr$^{cur.}$ It$^{aliq.}$ omit αυτω after ειπεν.

† Ver. 36. ℵ. B. L. Z. some Mnn. Vss. omit ουν after τις. Ver. 37. The mss. vary between ουν (T. R.) and δε (Alex.) after ειπε.

cored in distress? than Whom should I assist in case of distress? To the first question, the reply is not doubtful Self-regard coming to the aid of conscience, all will answer: By everybody. The scribe is quite alive to this. He cannot escape, when he is brought face to face with the question in this form. Only, as his heart refuses to pronounce the word Samaritan with praise, he paraphrases the odious name. On the use of *μετά*, ver. 37, see on 1 : 58. In this final declaration, Jesus contrasts the *doing* of the Samaritan with the vain casuistry of the Rabbins. But while saying, *Do thou likewise*, He does not at all add, as at ver. 28, *and thou shalt live*. For beneficence does not give life or salvation. Were it even the complete fulfilment of the second part of the sum of the law, we may not forget the first part, the realization of which, though not less essential to salvation, may remain a strange thing to the man of greatest beneficence. But what is certain is, that the man who in his conduct contradicts the law of nature, is on the way opposed to that which leads to faith and salvation (John 3 : 19–21).

The Fathers have dwelt with pleasure on the allegorical interpretation of this parable: The wounded man representing humanity; the brigands, the devil; the priest and Levite, the law and the prophets. The Samaritan is Jesus Himself; the oil and wine, divine grace; the ass, the body of Christ; the inn, the Church; Jerusalem, paradise; the expected return of the Samaritan, the final advent of Christ. This exegesis rivalled that of the Gnostics.

5. *Martha and Mary:* 10 : 38–42.—Here is one of the most exquisite scenes which Gospel tradition has preserved to us; it has been transmitted by Luke alone. What surprises us in the narrative is, the place which it occupies in the middle of a journey through Galilee. On the one hand, the expression *ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι αὐτους*, *as they went*, indicates that we have a continuation of the same journey as began at 9 : 51; on the other, the knowledge which we have of Martha and Mary, John 11, does not admit of a doubt that the event transpired in Judea at Bethany, near Jerusalem. Hengstenberg supposes that Lazarus and his two sisters dwelt first in Galilee, and afterward came to settle in Judea. But the interval between autumn and the following spring is too short to allow of such a change of residence. In John 11 : 1, Bethany is called *the town of Mary and her sister Martha*, a phrase which assumes that they had lived there for a length of time. The explanation is therefore a forced one. There is another more natural. In John 10 there is indicated a short visit of Jesus to Judea in the month of December of that year, at the feast of dedication. Was not that then the time when the visit took place which is here recorded by Luke? Jesus must have interrupted His evangelistic journey to go to Jerusalem, perhaps while the seventy disciples were carrying out their preparatory mission. After that short appearance in the capital, He returned to put Himself at the head of the caravan, to visit the places where the disciples had announced His coming. Luke himself certainly did not know the place where this scene transpired (*in a certain village*); he transmits the fact to us as he found it in his sources, or as he had received it by oral tradition, without more exact local indication. Importance had been attached rather to the moral teaching than to the external circumstances. It is remarkable that the scene of the preceding parable is precisely the country between Jericho and Jerusalem. Have we here a second proof of a journey to Judea at that period?

Here we must recall two things: 1. That the oral tradition from which our written compilations (with the exception of that of John) are derived, was formed immediately after the ministry of our Lord, when the actors in the Gospel drama were yet

alive, and that it was obliged to exercise great discretion in regard to the persons who figured in it, especially where women were concerned; hence the omission of many proper names. 2. That it is John's Gospel which has restored those names to the Gospel history; but that at the time when Luke wrote, this sort of *incognito* still continued.

Vers. 38–40.* *Martha's Complaint.*—It is probably the indefinite expression of Luke, *into a certain village*, which John means to define by the words: *Bethany, the town of Mary and her sister Martha*, 11 : 1; as also the words of Luke 5 : 39, *which sat at Jesus' feet*, seem to be alluded to in those others: *But Mary sat still in the house*, 11 : 20. The entire conduct of Martha and Mary, John 11, reproduces in every particular the characters of the two sisters as they appear from Luke 10. It has been supposed that Martha was the wife of Simon the Leper (Matt. 26 : 6; Mark 14 : 3), and that her brother and sister had become inmates of the house. All this is pure hypothesis. If the two words ἡ and καί, "which also sat," really belong to the text, Luke gives us to understand that Mary began by serving as well as Martha; but that, having completed her task, she also sat to listen, rightly considering that, with such a guest, the essential thing was not serving, but above all being herself served. Jesus was seated with His feet stretched behind Him (7 : 38). It was therefore at His feet behind Him that she took her place, not to lose any of His words. The term περιεσπᾶτο (*was cumbered*), ver. 40, denotes a distraction at once external and moral. The word ἐπιστᾶσα, *came to Him*, especially with δέ adversative, *but*, indicates a sudden suspension of her feverish activity; at the sight of Jesus and her sister, who was listening to Him with gladness, Martha stops short, takes up a bold attitude, and addresses the latter, reproaching her for her selfishness, and Jesus for His partiality, implied in the words, *Dost Thou not care?* Nevertheless, by the very word which she uses, κατέλιπε, *hath left me* (this reading is preferable to the imperfect κατέλειπε), she acknowledges that Mary up till then had taken part in serving. In the compound συναντιλαμβάνεσθαι three ideas are included—charging one's self with a burden (the middle) for another (ἀντί), and sharing it with him (σύν).

Vers. 41, 42.† *The Answer.*—Jesus replies to the reproach of Martha by charging her with exaggeration in the activity which she is putting forth. If she has so much trouble, it is because she wishes it. Μεριμᾷν, *to be careful*, refers to moral preoccupation; τυρβάζεσθαι, *to be troubled*, to external agitation. The repetition of Martha's name in the answer of Jesus is intended to bring her back gently, but firmly, from her dissipation of mind. The expression in which Jesus justifies His rebuke is at once serious and playful. According to the received reading, *One thing only is needful*, the thought might be: "A single dish is sufficient." But as it was certainly not a lesson on simplicity of food that Jesus wished to give here, we must in that case admit a double reference, like that which is so often found in the words of Jesus (John 4 : 31–34): "A single kind of nourishment is sufficient for the body, as one

* Ver. 38. ℵ. B. L. Z. Syr^{cur}., εν δε τω πορευεσθαι instead of εγενετο δε εν τω πορευεσθαι. ℵ. C. L. Z., οικιαν instead of οικον. ℵ*. L. Z. omit αυτης. B. omits εις . . . αυτης. Ver. 39. ℵ. L*. Z. omit η. D. It$^{aliq.}$ omit και after η. Instead of παρακαθισασα (T. R.), ℵ. A. B. C. L. Z., παρακαθεσθεισα. Instead of παρα, the same, προς. Instead of Ιησου, the same, κυριου. Ver. 40. Instead of κατελιπεν, 15 Mjj. κατελειπεν. D. L. Z., ειπον instead of ειπε.

† Ver. 41. ℵ. B. L. It$^{aliq.}$ Vg., ο κυριος instead of ο Ιησους. ℵ. B. C. D. L., θορυβαζη instead of τυρβαζη. Ver. 42. ℵ. B. L. 2 Mnn., ολιγων δε εστι χρεια η ενος instead of ενος δε εστι χρεια.

only is necessary for the soul." This is probably the meaning of the Alex. reading : "There needs but little (for the body), or even but one thing (for the soul)." There is subtilty in this reading , too much perhaps. It has against it 15 Mjj. the Peschito and a large number of the copies of the Itala. It is simpler to hold that by the expression *one thing*, Jesus meant to designate spiritual nourishment, the divine word, but not without an allusion to the simplicity in physical life which naturally results from the preponderance given to a higher interest. The expression ἀγαθὴ μερίς, *that good part*, alludes to the portion of honor at a feast. The pronoun ἥτις, *which as such*, brings out the relation between the excellence of this portion, and the impossibility of its being lost to him who has chosen it, and who perseveres in his choice. In this defence of Mary's conduct there is included an invitation to Martha to imitate her at once.

The two sisters have often been regarded as representing two equally legitimate aspects of the Christian life, inward devotion and practical activity. But Martha does not in the least represent external activity, such as Jesus approves. Her very distraction proves that the motive of her work is not pure, and that her self-importance as hostess has a larger share in it than it ought. On the other hand, Mary as little represents a morbid quietism, requiring to be implemented by the work of an active life. Mary served as long as it appeared to her needful to do so. Thereafter she understood also that, when we have the singular privilege of welcoming a Jesus under our roof it is infinitely more important to seek to receive than to give. Besides some months later (John 12 : 3 *et seq.*) Mary clearly showed that when action or giving was required she was second to none.

The Tübingen school has discovered depths in this narrative unknown till it appeared. In the person of Martha, Luke seeks to stigmatize Judaizing Christianity, that of legal works ; in the person of Mary he has exalted the Christianity of Paul, that of justification without works and by faith alone. What extraordinary prejudice must prevail in a mind which can to such a degree mistake the exquisite simplicity of this story ! Supposing that it really had such an origin, would not this dogmatic importation have infallibly discolored both the matter and form of the narrative ? A time will come when those judgments of modern criticism will appear like the wanderings of a diseased imagination.

6. *Prayer :* 11 : 1–13.—Continuing still to advance leisurely, the Lord remained faithful to His habit of prayer. He was not satisfied with that constant direction of soul toward His Father, to which the meaning of the command, *Pray without ceasing*, is often reduced. There were in His life special times and positive acts of prayer. This is proved by the following words : *When He ceased praying.* It was after one of those times, which no doubt had always something solemn in them for those who surrounded Him, that one of His disciples, profiting by the circumstance, asked Him to give a more special directory on the subject of prayer. Holtzmann is just enough to protest against this preface, ver. 1, being involved in the wholesale rejection which modern criticism visits on those short introductions of Luke. He finds a proof of its authenticity in the detail so precisely stated : "Teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples." It is, according to him, one of the cases in which the historical situation was expressly stated in the Logia. The Lord's Prayer, as well as the instructions about prayer which follow, are placed by Matthew in the course of the Sermon on the Mount (chap. 6 and 7). Gess thinks that this model of prayer may have been twice given forth. Why might not a disciple, some months

after the Sermon on the Mount, have put to Jesus the request which led Him to repeat it? And as to the context in Matthew, Luke 20 : 47 proves that much speaking belonged as much to the prayers of the Pharisees as to those of the heathen. That is true; but the prolixity to which the Lord's prayer is opposed in the Sermon on the Mount, and by means of which the worshipper hopes to obtain a hearing, has nothing to do with that ostentation before men which Jesus stigmatizes in Matt. 6 as characterizing the righteousness of the Pharisees. And the repetition of this model of prayer, though not impossible, is far from probable. What we have here, therefore, is one of those numerous elements, historically alien to the context of the Sermon on the Mount, which are found collected in this exposition of the new righteousness. The reflections regarding prayer, Matt. 7, belong to a context so broken, that if the connections alleged by commentators show to a demonstration what association of ideas the compiler has followed in placing them here, they cannot prove that Jesus could ever have taught in such a manner. In Luke, on the contrary, the connection between the different parts of this discourse is as simple as the occasion is natural. Here, again, we find the two evangelists such as we have come to know them: Matthew teaches, Luke relates.

This account embraces: 1*st*. The model of Christian prayer (vers. 1–4); 2*d*. An encouragement to pray thus, founded on the certainty of being heard (vers. 5–13).

1*st*. Vers. 1–4.* *The Model of Prayer.*—"And it came to pass, that as He was praying in a certain place, when He ceased, one of His disciples said unto Him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples. 2. And He said unto them, When ye pray, say, Father, hallowed be thy name; Thy kingdom come; 3. Give us day by day our needful bread; 4. And forgive us our sins, for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us; and lead us not into temptation." It was the custom among the Jews to pray regularly three times a day. John had kept up the practice, as well as that of fasting (ver. 33); and it was doubtless with a view to this daily exercise that he had given a form to his disciples. In the words, *when ye pray, say*, the term προσεύχεσθαι, *to pray*, denotes the state of adoration, and the word *say*, the prayer formally expressed. It is evident that this order, *when ye pray, say*, does not mean that the formula was to be slavishly repeated on every occasion of prayer; it was the type which was to give its impression to every Christian prayer, but in a free, varied, and spontaneous manner. The distinctive characteristic of this formulary is *the filial spirit*, which appears from the first in the invocation, *Father;* then in the object and order of the petitions. Of the five petitions which the Lord's Prayer includes in Luke, two bear directly on the cause of God—they stand at the head; three to the wants of man—they occupy the second place. This absolute

* Ver. 1. ℵ[a]. Δ. some Mnn. Syr[cur]. It[plerique] omit και before Ιωαννης. Ver. 2. The words ημων ευ τοις ουρανοις are omitted by ℵ. B. L. some Mnn. Tert.; they are found in T. R., according to 18 Mjj. almost all the Mnn. Syr. It. Ver. 3. Instead of ελθετω η βασιλεια σου, Gregory of Nyssa and Maximus Confessor seem to have read, ελθετω αγιον πνευμα σου εφ' ημας και καθαρισατω ημας; others to have added to the end of the petition an explanation like this: τουτ' εστι το πνευμα αγιον. B. L. some Mnn. Syr[cur]. It[aliq]. Vg. Tert. Aug. omit the words γενηθητω . . . γης, which are read by the T. R. with 19 Mjj. almost all the Mnn Syr[sch]. It[plerique]; Tert. (*de Oratione*) places them between the first and second petitions. Ver. 3. Instead of ημων Marcion appears to have read σου. Ver. 4 ℵ. B L. some Mnn. Vg. Orig. Cyril. Tert. Aug. omit the words αλλα . . . πονηρου, which are found in the T. R. with 17 Mjj. almost all the Mnn. Syr. It[plerique].

priority given to divine interests implies an emptying of ourselves, a heavenly love and zeal which are not natural to man, and which suppose in us the heart of a true child of God, occupied above all things with the interests of his heavenly Father. After having thus forgotten himself, and become lost as it were in God, the Christian comes back to himself ; but as it is in God that he finds himself again, he does not find himself alone. He contemplates himself as a member of God's family, and says thenceforth : *we*, and not *I*. *The fraternal spirit* becomes, in the second part of his prayer, the complement of the filial spirit which dictated the first ; intercession is blended with personal supplication. The Lord's Prayer is thus nothing else than the summary of the law put into practice ; and this summary so realized in the secrecy of the heart, will naturally pass thence into the entire life.

It appears certain from the MSS. that in the text of Luke the invocation ought to be reduced to the single word *Father*. The following words, *which art in heaven*, are a gloss taken from Matthew, but agreeable, no doubt, to the real tenor of our Lord's saying. In this title *Father* there is expressed the double feeling of submission and confidence. The name is found in the Old Testament only in Isa. 63 : 16 (comp. Ps. 103 : 13), and is employed only in reference to the nation as a whole. The pious Israelite felt himself the servant of Jehovah, not His child. The filial relationship which the believer sustains to God rests on the incarnation and revelation of the Son. Luke 10 : 22 : "He to whom the Son will reveal Him. . . ." Comp, John 1 : 12.

The first two petitions relate, not to the believer himself, or the world which surrounds him, but to the honor of God ; it is the child of God who is praying. Wetstein has collected a large number of passages similar to those two petitions, derived from Jewish formularies. The Old Testament itself is filled with like texts. But the originality of this first part of the Lord's Prayer is not in the words ; it is in the filial feeling which is here expressed by means of those already well-known terms. The *name of God* denotes, not His essence or His revelation as is often said, but rather the conception of God, whatever it may be, which the worshipper bears in his consciousness—His reflection in the soul of His creatures. Hence the fact that this name dwells completely only in One Being, in Him who is the adequate image of God, and who alone knows Him perfectly ; that One of whom God says, Ex. 23 : 21, "My name is in Him." Hence the fact that this name can become holier than it is—*be hallowed*, *rendered* holy. What unworthy conceptions of God and His character still reign among men ! The child of God prays Him to assert His holy character effectually in the minds of men, in order that all impure idolatry, gross or refined, as well as all pharisaic formalism, may forever come to an end, and that every human being may exclaim with the seraphim, in rapt adoration : *Holy, holy, holy !* (Isa. 6). The imper. aor. indicates a series of acts by which this result shall be brought about.

The holy image of God once shining in glory within the depths of the heart, the kingdom of God can be established there. For God needs only to be well known in order to reign. The term *kingdom of God* denotes an external and social state of things, but one which results from an inward and individual change. This petition expresses the longing of the child of God for that reconciled and sanctified humanity within the bosom of which the will of the Father will be done without opposition. The aor. ἐλθετω, *come*, comprises the whole series of historical facts which will realize this state of things. The imperatives, which follow one another in the Lord's Prayer with forcible brevity, express the certainty of being heard.

The third petition, "Thy will be . . ." which is found in the T. R., following several MSS., is certainly an importation from Matthew. It is impossible to discover any reason why so many MSS. should have rejected it in Luke. In Matthew it expresses the state of things which will result from the establishment of the kingdom of God over humanity so admirably, that there is no reason for doubting that it belongs to the Lord's Prayer as Jesus uttered it. The position of this petition between the two preceding in a passage of Tertullian, may arise either from the fact that it was variously interpolated in Luke, or from the fact that, in consequence of the eschatological sense which was given to the term *kingdom of God*, it was thought right to close the first part of the prayer with the petition which related to that object. Ver. 3. From the cause of God, the worshipper passes to the wants of God's *family*. The connection is this: "And that we may be able ourselves to take part in the divine work for whose advancement we pray, Give us, Forgive us," etc. In order to serve God, it is first of all necessary that we live. The Fathers in general understood the word *bread* in a spiritual sense: *the bread of life* (John 6); but the literal sense seems to us clearly to flow from the very general nature of this prayer, which demands at least one petition relating to the support of our present life. Jesus, who with His apostles lived upon the daily gifts of His Father, understood by experience, better perhaps than many theologians, the need which His disciples would have of such a prayer. No poor man will hesitate about the sense which is to be given to this petition. The word ἐπιούσιος is unknown either in profane or sacred Greek. It appears, says Origen, to have been invented by the evangelists. It may be taken as derived from ἐπειμι, *to be imminent*, whence the participle ἡ ἐπιοῦσα (ἡμέρα), *the coming day* (Prov. 27 : 1; Acts 7 : 26, *et al.*). We must then translate: "Give us day by day next day's bread." This was certainly the meaning given to the petition by the Gospel of the Hebrews, where this was rendered, according to Jerome, by לחם מחר *to morrow's bread*. Founding on the same grammatical meaning of ἐπιούσιος, Athanasius explains it: "The bread of the world to come." But those two meanings, and especially the second, are pure refinements. The first is not in keeping with Matt. 6 : 34: "Take no thought for the morrow; for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself." Comp. Ex. 16 : 19, *et seq.* It is therefore better to regard ἐπιούσιος as a compound of the substantive οὐσία, *essence, existence, goods*. No doubt ἐπι ordinarily loses its ι when it is compounded with a word beginning with a vowel. But there are numerous exceptions to the rule. Thus ἐπιεικής, ἐπίουρος (Homer), ἐπιορκεῖν, ἐπιετής (Polybius). And in the case before us, there is a reason for the irregularity in the tacit contrast which exists between the word and the analogous compound περιούσιος, *superfluous*. "Give us day by day bread sufficient for our existence, not what is superfluous." The expression, thus understood, exactly corresponds to that of Proverbs (30 : 8), לחם חקי, *food convenient for me*, literally, *the bread of my allowance*, in which the term חק, *statutum*, is tacitly opposed to the *superfluity*, περιούσιον, which is secretly desired by the human heart; and it is this biblical expression of which Jesus probably made use in Aramaic, and which should serve to explain that of our passage. It has been inferred, from the remarkable fact that the two evangelists employ one and the same Greek expression, otherwise altogether unknown, that one of the evangelists was dependent on the other, or that both were dependent on a common *Greek* document. But the very important differences which we observe in Luke and Matthew, between the two editions of the Lord's Prayer, contain one of the most decisive refutations of the two hypotheses. What

writer should have taken the liberty wilfully and arbitrarily to introduce such modifications into the text of a formulary* beginning with the words : "When ye pray, say . . ."? The differences here, still more than anywhere else, must be involuntary. It must therefore be admitted that this Greek term common to both was chosen to translate the Aramaic expression, at the time when the primitive oral tradition was reproduced in Greek for the numerous Jews speaking that language who dwelt in Jerusalem and Palestine (Acts 6 : 1, *et seq.* This translation, once fixed in the oral tradition, passed thence into our Gospels.

Instead of *day by day*, Matthew says σήμερον, *this day*. Luke's expression, from its very generality, does not answer so well to the character of real and present supplication. Matthew's form is therefore to be preferred. Besides, Luke employs the present δίδου, which, in connection with the expression *day by day*, must designate the permanent act : "Give us *constantly each day's* bread." The aor. δός, in Matthew, in connection with the word *this day*, designates the one single and momentary act, which is preferable. What a reduction of human requirements to their *minimum*, in the two respects of quality (bread) and of quantity (sufficient for each day) !

Ver. 4. The deepest feeling of man, after that of his dependence for his very existence, is that of his guiltiness ; and the first condition to enable him to act in the way which is indicated by the first petition, is his being relieved of this burden by pardon. For it is on pardon that the union of the soul with God rests. Instead of the word *sins*, Matthew in the first clause uses *debts*. Every neglect of duty to God really constitutes a debt requiring to be discharged by a penalty. In the second proposition Luke says : *For we ourselves also* (αὐτοί) ; Matthew : *as we also*. . . . The idea of an imprecation on ourselves, in the event of our refusing pardon to him who has offended us, might perhaps be found in the form of Matthew, but not in that of Luke. The latter does not even include the notion of a condition ; it simply expresses a *motive* derived from the manner in which we ourselves act in our humble sphere. This motive must undoubtedly be understood in the same sense as that of ver. 13 : "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children." "All evil as we are, we yet *ourselves* use the right of grace which belongs to us, by remitting debts to those who are our debtors ; how much more wilt not Thou, Father, who art goodness itself, use Thy right toward us !" And this is probably also the sense in which we should understand the *as also* of Matthew. The only difference is, that what Luke alleges as a motive (*for also*), Matthew states as a point of comparison (*as also*).

Luke's very absolute expression, *We forgive every one that is indebted to us*, supposes the believer to be now living in that sphere of charity which Jesus came to create on the earth, and the principle of which was laid down in the Sermon on the Mount. The term used by Jesus might be applied solely to material debts : "Forgive us our sins, for we also in our earthly relations relax our rights toward our indigent debtors." So we might explain Luke's use of the word *sins* in the first clause, and of the term ὀφείλοντι, *debtor*, in the second. This delicate shade would be lost in Matthew's form. It is possible, however, that by the words, *every one that is indebted to us*, in Luke, we are to understand not only debtors strictly so called, but every one

* Dr. Alford relies upon the variations as proof that this was not a "set form developed for liturgical uses" by our Lord. This is all the more weighty a confirmation of our author's view, as Dr. Alford might be naturally willing to fall in with such a view as Wordsworth's.—J. H.

who has offended us. The *παντί* is explained perhaps more easily in this wide sense of *ὀφείλοντι*. This petition, which supposes the Christian always penetrated to the last (*day by day*, ver. 3) by the conviction of his sins, has brought down on the Lord's Prayer the dislike of the Plymouth brethren, who regard it as a prayer provided rather for a Jewish than a Christian state. But comp. 1 John 1 : 9, which certainly applies to believers : "*If we confess* . . ." The absence of all allusion to the sacrifice of Jesus Christ for the pardon of sins is a very striking proof of the entire authenticity of this formula, both in Luke and Matthew. If Luke in particular had put into it anything of his own, even the least, would not some expression borrowed from the theology of the Epistle to the Romans have inevitably slipped from his pen?

With the feeling of his past trespasses there succeeds in the mind of the Christian that of his weakness, and the fear of offending in the future. He therefore passes naturally from sins to be forgiven to sin to be avoided. For he thoroughly apprehends that sanctification is the superstructure to be raised on the foundation of pardon. The word *tempt* takes two meanings in Scripture—to put a free being in the position of deciding for himself between good and evil, obedience and rebellion ; it is in this sense that God tempts : "God did tempt Abraham" (Gen. 22 : 1) ; or, to impel inwardly to evil, to make sin appear in a light so seducing that the frail and deceived being ends by yielding to it ; thus it is that Satan tempts, and that, according to Jas. 1 : 13, God *cannot tempt*. What renders it difficult to understand this last petition is, that neither of the two senses of the word *tempt* appears suitable here. If we adopt the good sense, how are we to ask God to spare us experiences which may be necessary for the development of our moral being, and for the manifestation of His glorious power in us (Jas. 1 : 3)? If we accept the bad sense, is it not to calumniate God, to ask Him not to do toward us an act decidedly wicked, diabolical in itself? The solution of this problem depends on our settling the question who is the author of the temptations anticipated. Now the second part of the prayer in Matthew, *But deliver us from the evil*, leaves no doubt on this point. The author of the temptations to which this petition relates is not God, but Satan. The phrase *ῥῦσαι ἀπό*, *rescue from*, is a military term, denoting the deliverance of a prisoner who had fallen into the hands of an enemy. The enemy is the evil one, who lays his snares in the way of the faithful. These, conscious of the danger which they run, as well as of their ignorance and weakness, pray God to preserve them from the snares of *the adversary*. The word *εἰσφέρειν* has been rendered, *to expose to*, or, *to abandon to ;* but these translations do not convey the force of the Greek term, *to impel into, to deliver over to*. God certainly does not impel to evil ; but it is enough for Him to withdraw His hand that we may find ourselves given over to the power of the enemy. It is the *παραδιδόναι*, *giving up*, of which Paul speaks (Rom. 1 · 24, 26–28), and by which is manifested His wrath against the Gentiles. Thus He punishes sin, that of pride in particular, by the most severe of chastisements, even sin itself. All that God needs thereto is not to act, no more to guard us ; and man, given over to himself, falls into the power of the enemy (2 Sam. 24 : 1, comp. with 1 Chron. 21 : 1). Such is the profound conviction of the believer ; hence his prayer, "Let me do nothing this day which would force Thee for a single moment to withdraw Thy hand, and to give me over to one of the snares which the evil one will plant in my way. Keep me in the sphere where Thy holy will reigns, and where the evil one has no access." * The second clause, *but*

* This is what a pious man used to express in the following terms, in which be

deliver us . . . is in Luke, an interpolation derived from Matthew. Without this termination the prayer is not really closed as it ought to be. Here again, therefore, Matthew is more complete than Luke. The doxology with which we close the Lord's Prayer, is not found in any MS. of Luke, and is wanting in the oldest copies of Matthew. It is an appendix due to the liturgical use of this formulary, and which has been added in the text of the first Gospel, the most commonly used in public reading.

The Lord's Prayer, especially in the form given by Matthew, presents to us a complete whole, composed of two ascending and to some extent parallel series. We think that we have established—1*st*. That it is Luke who has preserved to us most faithfully the situation in which this model prayer was taught, but that it is Matthew who has preserved the terms of it most fully and exactly. There is no contradiction, whatever M. Gess may think, between those two results. 2*d*. That the two digests can neither be derived the one from the other, nor both of them from a common document. Bleek himself is forced here to admit a separate source for each evangelist. How, indeed, with such a document, is it possible to imagine the capricious omissions in which Luke must have indulged, or the arbitrary additions which Matthew must have allowed himself? Holtzmann thinks that Matthew amplified the formulary of the *Logia* reproduced by Luke, with the view of raising the number of petitions to the (sacred) number of *seven*. But (*a*) the division into *seven* petitions is a fiction; it corresponds neither with the evident symmetry of the two parts of the prayer, each composed of *three* petitions, nor with the true meaning of the last petition, which, contrary to all reason, would require to be divided into two. (*b*) The parts peculiar to Matthew have perfect internal probability. It has been concluded from those differences that this formulary was not yet in use in the worship of the primitive Church. If this argument were valid, it would apply also to the formula instituting the holy Supper, which is untenable. The formula of the Lord's Prayer was preserved at first, like all the rest of the Gospel history, by means of oral tradition; it thus remained exposed to secondary modifications, and these passed quite simply into the first written digests, from which our synoptical writers have drawn.

2*d*. Vers. 5–13. *The Efficacy of Prayer.*—After having declared to His own the essential objects to be prayed for, Jesus encourages them thus to pray by assuring them of the efficacy of the act. He proves this (1) by an example, that of the indiscreet friend (vers. 5–8); (2) by common experience (vers. 9 and 10); (3) by the fatherly goodness of God (vers. 11–13).

Vers. 5–8.* This parable is peculiar to Luke. Holtzmann says: "Taken from A." But why in that case has Matthew omitted it, he who reproduces from A both the preceding and following verses (7 : 7–11)? The form of expression is broken after ver. 7. It is as if the importuned friend were reflecting what he should do. His friendship hesitates. But a circumstance decides him: the perseverance, carried even to shamelessness (*ἀναιδεία*), of his friend who does not desist from crying and knocking. The construction of ver. 7 does not harmonize with that with which the parable had opened (ver. 5). There were two ways of expressing the thought: either to say, "*Which of you* shall have a friend, and shall say to him . . . and [if] the latter shall answer . . . [will not persist until] . . . ;" or to say, "*If one of you*

paraphrased this petition: "If the occasion of sinning presents itself, grant that the desire may not be found in me: if the desire is there, grant that the occasion may not present itself."

* Ver. 5. A. D. K. M. P. R. Π. several Mnn. It^{plerique}: *ερει* instead of *ειπη*. Ver. 6. 14 Mjj. 100 Mnn. Syr$^{sch.}$ omit *μου*, which is read by the T. R. with ℵ. A. B. L. X. most of the Mnn. Syr$^{cur.}$ It. Ver. 8. The MSS. are divided between *οσων* (Alex.) and *οσου* (Byz.).

hath a friend, and sayeth to him . . . and he answer him . . . [nevertheless] I say unto you . . . " Jesus begins with the first form, which takes each hearer more directly aside, and continues (ver. 7) with the second, which better suits so lengthened a statement. The reading *εἴπῃ* may be explained by the *εἴπῃ* which follows ver. 7, as the reading *ἐρεῖ* by the Futures which precede. The first has more authorities in its favor. The figure of the *three loaves* should not be interpreted allegorically; the meaning of it should follow from the picture taken as a whole. One of the loaves is for the traveller; the second for the host, who must seat himself at table with him; the third will be their reserve. The idea of full sufficiency (*ὅσων χρήζει*) is the real application to be made of this detail.

Vers. 9 and 10.* "And I say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. 10. For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened." Ver. 9 formally expresses the application of the preceding example; all the figures appear to be borrowed from that example. That is evident in the case of knocking. The word *ask* probably alludes to the cries of the friend in distress, and the word *seek* to his efforts to find the door in the night, or in endeavoring to open it. The gradation of those figures includes the idea of increasing energy in the face of multiplying obstacles. A precept this which Jesus had learned by His personal experience (3 : 21, 22).

Ver. 10 confirms the exhortation of ver. 9 by daily experience. The future, *it shall be opened*, which contrasts with the two presents, *receiveth, findeth*, is used because in this case it is not the same individual who performs the two successive acts, as in the former two. The opening of the door depends on the will of another person. How can we help admiring here the explanation afforded by Luke, who, by the connection which he establishes between this precept and the foregoing example, so happily accounts for the choice of the figures used by our Lord, and brings into view their entire appropriateness? In Matthew, on the contrary, this saying is found placed in the midst of a series of precepts, at the end of the Sermon on the Mount, detached from the parable which explains its figures; it produces the effect of a petal torn from its stalk, and lying on the spot where the wind has let it fall. Who could hesitate between the two narratives?

Vers. 11–13.† "If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or if he ask a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent? 12. Or if he shall ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion? 13. If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him!" Undoubtedly it sometimes happens in human relations, that the maxim of ver. 10 does not hold good. But in a paternal and filial relationship, such as that which was set before us by the model given at the beginning, success is certain. It is a Father to whom the believer

* Ver. 9. The MSS. are divided here, as well as at ver. 10, between *ανοιχθησεται* and *ανοιγησεται* (the second probably taken from Matthew)

† Ver. 11. ℵ. D. L. X. 6 Mnn. Vg. Or., *τις* instead of *τινα*. 11 Mjj. 50 Mnn. It. Vg. read *εξ* before *υμων*. Or. Epiph. omit *ο* before *υιος*. ℵ. L. 1 Mn. It$^{aliq.}$ Vg. omit *ο υιος*. All the Mjj. read, before *και, ει* instead of *η*, which the T. R. reads, with some Mnn. only. Ver. 12. ℵ B. L. some Mnn., *η και* instead of *η και εαν*. Ver. 13. ℵ. D. K. M. X Γ. several Mnn., *οντες* instead of *υπαρχοντες*. C. U. several Mnn. Vss. add *υμων* after *πατηρ*. ℵ. L. X. Syr. It^{plerique}, omit *ο* before *εξ ουρανου*. L. 8 Mnn. Vg., *πνευμα αγαθον* instead of *πνευμα αγιον*.

prays ; and when praying to Him in conformity with the model prescribed, he is sure to ask nothing except those things which such a Father cannot refuse to His child, and instead of which that Father would not give him other things, either hurtful or even less precious. The end of the piece thus brings us back to the starting-point : the title *Father* given to God, and the filial character of him who prays the Lord's Prayer. Δέ, *then*, relates to the *à fortiori*, in the certainty which we have just expressed. The reading of some Alex., τίς . . . ὁ υἱός or υἱός, " What son shall ask of his father," would appeal to the feeling of sonship among the hearers ; the reading τίνα . . . is clearly to be preferred to it, " What father of whom his son shall ask," by which Jesus appeals to the heart of fathers in the assembly. The three articles of food enumerated by Jesus appear at first sight to be chosen at random. But, as M. Bovet * remarks, loaves, hard eggs, and fried fishes are precisely the ordinary elements of a traveller's fare in the East. Matthew omits the third ; Luke has certainly not added it at his own hand. The correspondence between bread and stone, fish and serpent, egg and scorpion, appears at a glance. In the teaching of Jesus all is picturesque, full of appropriateness, exquisite even to the minutest details. Ἐπιδιδόναι, to transfer *from hand to hand*. This word, which is not repeated in ver. 13, includes this thought : " What Father will have the courage to put into the hand . . . ?"

The conclusion, ver. 13, is drawn by a new argument *à fortiori ;* and the reasoning is still further strengthened by the words, *ye being evil*. The reading ὑπάρχοντες, " finding yourselves evil," seems more in harmony with the context than ὄντες, *being* (which is taken from Matthew, where the readings do not vary). Ὑπάρχειν denotes the actual state as the starting-point for the supposed activity. Bengel justly observes : *Illustre testimonium de peccato originali*. The reading of the Alex., which omits ὁ before ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, would admit of the translation, *will give from heaven*. But there is no reason in the context which could have led Luke to put this construction so prominently. *From heaven* thus depends on the word *Father*, and the untranslatable Greek form can only be explained by introducing the verbal notion of giving between the substantive and its government : " The Father who giveth from heaven." Instead of *the Holy Spirit*, Matthew says, *good things ;* and De Wette accuses Luke of having corrected him in a spiritualizing sense. He would thus have done here exactly the opposite of that which has been imputed to him in respect to 6 : 20 ! Have we not then a complete proof that Luke took this whole piece from a source peculiar to himself ? As to the intrinsic value of the two expressions, that of Matthew is simple and less didactic , that of Luke harmonizes better perhaps with the elevated sphere of the Lord's Prayer, which is the starting-point of the piece. The use of the simple δώσει (instead of ἐπιδώσει, ver 12) arises from the fact that the idea does not recur of giving from hand to hand.

We regard this piece as one of those in which the originality and excellence of Luke's sources appear in their full light, although we consider the comparison of Matthew indispensable to restore the words of our Lord in their entirety.

7. *The Blasphemy of the Pharisees :* 11 : 14–36.—We have already observed (see on 6 · 11) how remarkably coincident in time are the accusations called forth in Galilee by the healings on the Sabbath, and those which are raised about the same period at Jerusalem by the healing of the impotent man (John 5). There is a similar corre-

* See the charming passage, " Voyage en Terre-Sainte," p. 362, 6th ed.

spondence between the yet graver accusation of complicity with Beelzebub, raised against Jesus on the occasion of His healing demoniacs, and the charge brought against Him at Jerusalem at the feasts of Tabernacles and of the Dedication: "Thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil!" (John 8 : 48); "He hath a devil, and is mad!" (10 : 20). Matthew (chap. 12) and Mark (chap. 3) place this accusation and the answer of Jesus much earlier, in the first part of the Galilean ministry. The accusation may and must have often been repeated. The comparison of John would tell in favor of Luke's narrative. Two sayings which proceeded from the crowd give rise to the following discourse: the accusation of complicity with Beelzebub (ver. 15), and the demand for a sign from heaven (ver. 16). It might seem at first sight that these are two sayings simply placed in juxtaposition; but it is not so. The second is intended to offer Jesus the means of clearing Himself of the terrible charge involved in the first: "Work a miracle in the heavens, that sphere which is exclusively divine, and we shall then acknowledge that it is God who acts through thee, and not Satan." This demand in appearance proceeds from a disposition favorable to Jesus; but as those who address Him reckon on his powerlessness to meet the demand, the result of the test, in their view, will be a condemnation without appeal. Those last are therefore in reality the worst intentioned, and it is in that light that Luke's text represents them. Matthew isolates the two questions, and simply puts in juxtaposition the two discourses which reply to them (12 : 22 *et seq.*, 30 *et seq.*); thus the significant connection which we have just indicated disappears. It is difficult to understand how Holtzmann and other moderns can see nothing in this relation established by Luke, but a specimen of his "[arbitrary] manner of joining together pieces which were detached in the Logia (A)."

This piece includes: 1*st.* A statement of the facts which gave rise to the two following discourses (vers. 14–16); 2*d.* The first discourse in reply to the accusation of ver. 15 (vers. 17–26); 3*d.* An episode showing the deep impression produced on the people by this discourse (vers. 27 and 28); 4*th.* The second discourse in reply to the challenge thrown out to Jesus, ver. 16 (vers. 29–36).

1*st.* Vers. 14–16.* Ἦν ἐκβάλλων, *He was occupied in casting out.* The word κωφός *dull*, may mean *deaf* or *dumb;* according to the end of the verse, it here denotes dumbness. On the expression *dumb devil*, see p. 276. Bleek justly concludes, from this term, that the dumbness was of a psychical, not an organic nature. The construction ἐγένετο . . . ἐλάλησεν betrays an Aramaic source. The accusation, ver. 15, is twice mentioned by Matthew—9 : 32, on the occasion of a deaf man possessed, but without Jesus replying to it; then 12 : 22, which is the parallel passage to ours; here the possessed man is dumb and blind. Should not those two miracles be regarded as only one and the same fact, the account of which was taken first (Matt. 9) from the Logia, second (Matt. 12) from the proto-Mark, as Holtzmann appears to think, therein following his system to its natural consequences? But in that case we should have the result, that the Logia, the collection of discourses, contained the fact without the discourse, and that the proto-Mark, the strictly historical writing, contained the discourse without the fact—a strange anomaly, it must be confessed! In Mark 3 this accusation is connected with the step of the brethren of Jesus who come

* Ver. 14. Και αυτο ην is wanting in ℵ B. L. 7 Mnn. Syr^{cur}. A. C. L. X. 6 Mnn., εκβληθεντος instead of εξελθοντος. D. It$^{aliq.}$ present this verse under a somewhat different form. Ver. 15. A. D. K. M. X. Π. 40 Mnn. read here a long appendix taken from Mark 3 : 23.

to lay hold of Him, because they have heard say that He is *beside Himself*, that He is mad (3 : 21, ὅτι ἐξέστη). This expression is nearly synonymous with that of *possessed* (John 10 : 20). According to this accusation, it was thus as one Himself possessed by the prince of the devils that Jesus had the power of expelling inferior devils. From this point of view, the ἐν, *through*, before the name Beelzebub, has a more forcible sense than appears at the first glance. It signifies not only by the authority of, but by Beelzebub himself dwelling personally in Jesus. This name given to Satan appears in all the documents of Luke, and in almost all those of Matthew, with the termination *bul ;* and this is certainly the true reading. It is probable, however, that the name is derived from the Heb. *Baal-Zebub*, *God of Flies*, a divinity who, according to 2 Kings 1 *et seq.*, was worshipped at Ekron, a city of the Philistines, and who may be compared with the Ζεὺς Ἀπομυῖος of the Greeks. The invocation of this god was doubtless intended to preserve the country from the scourge of flies. In contempt, the Jews applied this name to Satan, while modifying its last syllable so as to make it signify *God of Dung* (*Baal-Zebul*). Such is the explanation given by Lightfoot, Wetstein, Bleek, etc. Those who raise this accusation are, in Luke, some of the numerous persons present ; in Matthew (9 : 34, 12 : 24), *the Pharisees ;* in Mark (3 : 22), *scribes which came down fr m Jerusalem.* This last indication by Mark would harmonize with the synchronism which we have established in regard to this accusation between Luke and John.

The demand for a sign from heaven (ver. 16) is mentioned twice in Matt., 12 : 38 and 16 : 1. It is not impossible that it may have been repeated again and again (comp. John 6 : 30). It corresponded with the ruling tendency of the Israelitish mind, the seeking for miracles, the σημεῖα αἰτεῖν (1 Cor. 1 : 22). We have already explained its bearing in the present case. In John it signifies more particularly, "Show thyself superior to Moses." In those different forms it was ever the repetition of the third temptation (πειράζοντες, *tempting* Him). How, indeed, could Jesus avoid being tempted to accept this challenge, and so to confound by an act of signal power the treacherous accusation which He found raised against Him !

2*d. The First Discourse :* vers. 17–26.—It is divided into two parts : Jesus refutes this blasphemous explanation of His cures (vers. 17–19) ; He gives their true explanation (vers. 20–26).

Vers. 17–19. "But He, knowing their thoughts, said unto them : Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation ; and one house falls upon another. 18. If Satan also be divided against himself, how shall his kingdom stand ? because ye say that I cast out devils through Beelzebub. 19. And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out ? therefore shall they be your judges." In vers. 17 and 18 Jesus appeals to the common-sense of His hearers ; it is far from natural to suppose that the devil would fight against himself. It is true, it might be rejoined that Satan drove out his underlings, the better to accredit Him as his Messiah. Jesus does not seem to have referred to this objection. In any case, the sequel would answer it , the devil can remove the diabolical spirit, but not replace it by the Holy Spirit. Διανοήματα, *their thoughts*, denotes the wicked source concealed behind such words (vers. 15 and 16). The words, "And one house falls upon another," appear to be in Luke the development of the ἐρημοῦται, *is brought to desolation :* the ruin of families, as a consequence of civil discord. In Matthew and Mark they evidently include a new example, parallel to the preceding one. This sense is also admissible in Luke, if we make the object ἐπὶ οἶκον depend, not on πίπτει, but

on *διαμερισθείς* . . . : "And likewise a house divided against a house falls." The *εἰ δὲ καί*, ver. 18, here signifies, *and entirely so if*. . . . In the appendix, *because ye say*, there is revealed a deep feeling of indignation. This emphatic form recalls that of Mark (3 : 30) : "Because they said, He hath an unclean spirit." The two analogous terms of expression had become fixed in the tradition (comp. 5 : 24 and parall. ; see also on 13 : 18) ; but their form is sufficiently different to prove that the one evangelist did not copy from the other.

By this first reply Jesus has simply enlisted common-sense on His side. He now thrusts deeper the keen edge of His logic, ver. 19. If the accusation raised against Him is well-founded, His adversaries must impute to many of the sons of Israel the same compact with Satan. We know from the N. T. and Josephus, that there were at that time numerous Jewish exorcists who made a business of driving out devils for money (Acts 19 : 13 : "Certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists . . ." Comp. Josephus, Antiq. 8 : 2. 5).* The Talmud also speaks of those exorcists, who took David, healing Saul by his songs, as their patron, and Solomon as the inventor of their incantations : "They take roots, fumigate the patient, administer to him a decoction, and the spirit vanishes" (Tauch. f. 70, 1). Such are the persons whom Jesus designated by the expression, *your sons*. Several Fathers have thought that He meant His own apostles, who also wrought like cures ; but the argument would have had no value with Jews, for they would not have hesitated to apply to the cures wrought by the disciples the explanation with which they had just stigmatized those of the Master. De Wette, Meyer, and Neander give to the word *sons* the meaning which it has in the expression *sons of the prophets*, that of disciples. But is it proved that those exorcists studied in the Rabbinical schools? Is it not simpler to explain the term *your sons* in this sense : "You own countrymen—your flesh and blood—whom you do not think of repudiating, but from whom, on the contrary, you take glory when they perform works of power similar to mine ; they do not work signs in the heavens, and yet you do not suspect their cures. They shall confound you therefore before the divine tribunal, by convicting you of having applied to me a judgment which you should with much stronger reason have applied to them." In reality, what a contrast was there between the free and open strife which Jesus maintained with the malignant spirits whom He expelled, and the suspicious manipulations in which those exorcists indulged! between the entire physical and moral restoration which His word brought to the sick who were healed by Him, and the

* "I have seen one of my countrymen, named Eleazar, who in the presence of Vespasian and his sons, captains and soldiers, delivered persons possessed with devils. The manner of his cure was this : Bringing close to the nostrils of the possessed man his ring, under the bezel of which there was inclosed one of the roots prescribed by Solomon, he made him smell it, and thus gradually he drew out the demon through the nostrils. The man then fell on the ground, and the exorcist commanded the demon to return into him no more, uttering all the while the name of Solomon, and reciting the incantations which he composed. Wishing to convince the bystanders of the power which he exercised, and to demonstrate it to them, Eleazar placed a little way off a cup or basin full of water, and commanded the demon to overturn it as he went out of the man, and thereby to furnish proof to the spectators that he had really quitted him. That having taken place, the knowledge and wisdom of Solomon were evident to all." Comp. "Bell. Jud.," vii. 6. 3, where the magical root mentioned, a sort of rue (*πήγανον*), is called *Baara*, from the name of the valley where it was gathered with infinite trouble, near the fortress of Machærus.

half cures, generally followed by relapses, which they wrought! To ascribe the imperfect cures to God, and to refer the perfect cures to the devil—what logic!

Vers. 20–26. After having by this new *argumentum ad hominem* refuted the supposition of His adversaries, Jesus gives the true explanation of His cures by contrasting the picture of one of those expulsions which He works (vers. 20–22) with that of a cure performed by the exorcists (vers. 23–26).

Vers. 20–22. "But if I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you. 21. When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace. 22. But when a stronger than he shall come upon him and overcome him, he taketh from him all his armor wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils." Ver. 20 draws the conclusion (δέ, *now*; ἄρα, *then*) from the preceding arguments, and forms the transition to the two following scenes. In this declaration there is betrayed intense indignation: "Let them take heed! The kingdom of God, for which they are waiting, is already there without their suspecting it; and it is upon it that their blasphemies fall. They imagine that it will come with noise and tumult; and it has come more quickly than they thought, and far otherwise it has *reached* them (ἔφθασεν). The construction ἐσ' ὑμᾶς, *upon you*, has a threatening sense. Since they set themselves in array against it, it is an enemy which has surprised them, and which will crush them. The term *finger of God* is admirably in keeping with the context: the arm is the natural seat and emblem of strength; and the finger, the smallest part of the arm, is the symbol of the ease with which this power acts. Jesus means, "As for me, I have only to lift my finger to make the devils leave their prey." These victories, so easily won, prove that henceforth Satan has found his conqueror, and that now God begins really to reign. This word, full of majesty, unveils to His adversaries the grandeur of the work which is going forward, and what tragic results are involved in the hostile attitude which they are taking toward it. Instead of *by the finger of God*, Matthew says *by the Spirit of God*; and Weizsäcker, always in favor of the hypothesis of a common document, supposes that Luke has designedly replaced it by another, because it seemed to put Jesus in dependence on the Holy Spirit. What may a man not prove with such criticism? Is it not simpler, with Bleek, to regard the figurative term of Luke as the original form in the saying of Jesus, which has been replaced by the abstract but radically equivalent expression of Matthew? Mark omits the two verses 19 and 20. Why would he have done so, if he had had before his eyes the same document as the others?

Vers. 21 and 22 serve to illustrate the thought of ver. 20: the citadel of Satan is plundered; the fact proves that Satan is vanquished, and that the kingdom of God is come. A strong and well-armed warrior watches at the gate of his fortress. So long as he is in this position (ὅταν), all is tranquil (ἐν εἰρήνῃ) in his fastness; his captives remain chained, and his booty (σκῦλα) is secure. The warrior is Satan (the art. ὁ alludes to a single and definite personality); his castle is the world, which up till now has been his confirmed property. His armor consists of those powerful means of influence which he wields. His booty is, first of all, according to the context, those possessed ones, the palpable monuments of his sway over humanity; and in a wider sense, that humanity itself, which with mirth or groans bears the chains of sin. But a warrior superior in strength has appeared on the world's stage; and from that moment all is changed. Ἐπάν, *from the time that*, denotes the abrupt and decisive character of this succession to power, in opposition to ὅταν, *as long as*, which

suited the period of security. This stronger man is Jesus (the art. *ὁ* also alludes to His definite personality). He alone can really plunder the citadel of the prince of this world. Why? Because He alone began by conquering him in single combat. This victory in a personal engagement was the preliminary condition of His taking possession of the earth. It cannot be doubted that, as Keim and Weizsäcker acknowledge, Jesus is here thinking of the scene of His temptation. That spiritual triumph is the foundation laid for the establishment of the kingdom of God on the earth, and for the destruction of that of Satan. As soon as a man can tell the prince of this world to his face, "Thou hast nothing in me" (John 14 : 30), the stronger man, the vanquisher of the strong man, is come; and the plundering of his house begins. This plundering consists, first of all, of the healings of the possessed wrought by Jesus. Thus is explained the ease with which He performs those acts by which He rescues those unhappy ones from malignant powers, and restores them to God, to themselves, and to human society. All the figures of this scene are evidently borrowed from Isa. 49 : 24, 25, where Jehovah Himself fills the part of liberator, which Jesus here ascribes to Himself.

Vers. 23–26.* "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth. 24. When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest; and finding none, he saith, I will return unto my house whence I came out. 25. And when he cometh, he findeth it swept and garnished. 26. Then goeth he, and taketh to him seven other spirits more wicked than himself; and they enter in, and dwell there: and the last state of that man is worse than the first." The relation between ver. 23 and the verses which precede and follow has been thought so obscure by De Wette and Bleek that they give up the attempt to explain it. In itself the figure is clear. It is that of a troop which has been dispersed by a victorious enemy, and which its captain seeks to rally, after having put the enemy to flight; but false allies hinder rather than promote the rallying. Is it so difficult to understand the connection of this figure with the context? The dispersed army denotes humanity, which Satan has conquered; the chief who rallies it is Jesus; the seeming allies, who have the appearance of fighting for the same cause as He does, but who in reality scatter abroad with Satan, are the exorcists. Not having conquered for themselves the chief of the kingdom of darkness, it is only in appearance that they can drive out his underlings; in reality, they serve no end by those alleged exploits, except to strengthen the previous state of things, and to keep up the reign of the ancient master of the world. Such is the object which the following illustration goes to prove. By the thrice-repeated *ἐμοῦ*, *me*, of ver. 23, there is brought into relief the decisive importance of the part which Jesus plays in the history of humanity; He is the impersonation of the kingdom of God; His appearance is the advent of a new power. The words *σκορπίζειν*, *to disperse*, and *συνάγειν*, *to gather together*, are found united in the same sense as here, John 10 : 13–16.

The two following verses serve to illustrate the saying of ver. 23, as vers. 21 and 22 illustrated the declaration of ver. 20. They are a sort of apologue poetically describing a cure wrought by the means which the exorcists employ, and the end of which is to show, that to combat Satan apart from Christ, his sole conqueror, is to work for him and against God; comp. the opposite case, 9 : 49, 50. The exorcist

* Ver. 24. ℵᶜ. B. L. X. Z. some Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ read *τοτε* after *ευρισκον*. The MSS. are divided between *ευρισκου* and *ευρισκων*, and at ver. 25 between *ελθον* and *ελθων*. Ver. 25. ℵᶜ. B. C. L. R. Γ. 12 Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ read *σχολαζοντα* after *ευρισκει* (taken from Matthew). Ver. 26. The MSS. are divided between *εισελθοντα* and *ἐλθοντα*.

has plied his art ; the impure spirit has let go his prey, quitted his dwelling, which for the time has become intolerable to him. But two things are wanting to the cure to make it real and durable. First of all, the enemy has not been conquered, bound ; he has only been expelled, and he is free to take his course of the world, perhaps to return. Jesus, on the other hand, sent the malignant spirits to their prison, the abyss whence they could no longer come forth till the judgment (8 : 31, 4 : 34) Then the house vacated is not occupied by a new tenant, who can bar the entrance of it against the old one. Jesus, on the contrary, does not content Himself with expelling the demon ; He brings back the soul to its God ; He replaces the unclean spirit by the Holy Spirit. As a relapse after a cure of this sort is impossible, so is it probable and imminent in the former case. Every line of the picture in which Jesus represents this state of things is charged with irony. The spirit driven out walks *through dry places*. This strange expression was probably borrowed from the formulas of exorcism. The spirit was relegated to the desert, the presumed abode of evil spirits (Tob. 8 : 3 ; Baruch 4 : 35). The reference was the same in the symbolical sending of the goat into the wilderness for Azazel, the prince of the devils.

But the malignant spirit, after roaming for a time, begins to regret the loss of his old abode ; would it not be well, he asks himself, to return to it ? He is so sure that he needs only to will it, that he exclaims with sarcastic gayety : I will return unto my house. At bottom he knows very well that he has not ceased to be the proprietor of it ; a proprietor is only dispossessed in so far as he is replaced. First he determines to reconnoitre. Having come, he finds that the house is disposable (*σχολάζοντα*, Matt.). He finds what is better still : the exorcist has worked with so much success, that the house has recovered a most agreeable air of propriety, order, and comfort since his departure. Far, therefore, from being closed against the malignant spirit, it is only better prepared to receive him. Jesus means thereby to describe the restoration of the physical and mental powers conferred by the half cures which He is stigmatizing. Anew there is a famous work of destruction to be accomplished—Satan cares for no other—but this time it is not to be done by halves. And therefore there is need for reinforcement. Besides, it is a festival ; there is need of friends. The evil spirit goes off to seek a number of companions sufficient to finish the work which had been interrupted. These do not require a second bidding, and the merry crew throw themselves into their dwelling. This time, we may be sure, nothing will be wanting to the physical, intellectual, and moral destruction of the possessed. Such was the state in which Jesus had found the Gergesene demoniac (8 : 29), and probably also Mary Magdalene (8 : 2). This explains in those two cases the words *Legion* (8 : 30) and *seven devils* (8 : 2), which are both symbolical expressions for a desperate state resulting from one or more relapses. Nothing is clearer than this context, or more striking than this scene, in which it is impossible for us to distinguish fully between what belongs to the idea and what to the figure. Thus has Jesus succeeded in retorting upon the exorcists, so highly extolled by His adversaries, the reproach of being auxiliaries of Satan, which they had dared to cast on Him. Need we wonder at the enthusiasm which this discourse excited in the multitude, and at the exclamation of the woman, in which this feeling of admiration finds utterance ?

3*d*. Vers. 27, 28.* *The Incident.*—" And it came to pass, as He spake these things,

* Ver 28. The mss. are divided between *μενουνγε* (T. R.) and *μενουν* (Alex.). 8 Mjj. 15 Mnn. It. omit *αυτον* after *φυλασσοντες*.

a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice, and said unto Him, Blessed is the womb that bare Thee, and the paps which Thou hast sucked. 28. But He said, Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it." Perhaps, like Mary Magdalene, this woman had herself experienced the two kinds of healing which Jesus had been contrasting. In any case, living in a society where scenes of the kind were passing frequently, she had not felt the same difficulty in apprehending the figures as we, to whom they are so strange. Jesus in His answer neither denies nor affirms the blessedness of her who gave Him birth. All depends on this, if she shall take rank in the class of those whom alone He declares to be blessed. The true reading appears to be *μενοῦνγε, μενοῦν.* "There is undoubtedly a blessedness;" *γε* (the restricting particle as always): "at least for those who . . ."

Does not this short account bear in itself the seal of its historical reality? It is altogether peculiar to Luke, and suffices to demonstrate the originality of the source from which this whole piece was derived. For this incident could not possibly stand as a narrative by itself; it must have formed part of the account of the entire scene.

The allegorical tableau, ver. 24 *et seq.*, is set by Matthew in an altogether different place, and so as to give it a quite different application (12 . 43 *et seq.*). The words with which it closes, "Even so shall it be also unto this wicked generation," prove that it is applied in that Gospel to the Jewish people taken collectively. The old form of possession was the spirit of idolatry; that of the present, seven times worse, is the Rabbinical pride, the pharisaic formalism and hypocrisy, which have dominion over the nation in the midst of its monotheistic zeal. The stroke which will fall upon it will be seven times more terrible than that with which it was visited when it was led into captivity in Jeremiah's day. This application is certainly grand and felicitous. But it forces us entirely to separate this scene, vers. 24–26, as the first Gospel does, from the preceding, vers. 21, 22, which in Matthew as well as in Luke can only refer to the healing of cases of possession; and yet those two scenes are indisputably the pendants of one another. Gess understands the application of this word in Matthew to the Jewish people in a wholly different sense. The first cure, according to him, was the enthusiastic impulse of the people in favor of Jesus in the beginning of His Galilean ministry; the relapse referred to the coldness which had followed, and which had obliged Jesus to teach in parables. But nowhere does Jesus make so marked an allusion to that crisis, to which probably the conscience of the people was not awakened. Would it not be better in this case to apply the first cure to the powerful effect produced by John the Baptist? "Ye were willing for a season," says Jesus Himself, "to rejoice in his light" (John 5 : 35) Anyhow, what leads Matthew to convert the second scene into a national apologue, instead of leaving it with its demonological and individual application, is his insertion, immediately before, of the saying which relates to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit—a saying which in Mark also follows the scene of the combat between the strong man and the stronger man. When, after so grave an utterance, Matthew returns to the scene (omitted by Mark) of the spirit recovering possession of his abandoned dwelling, he must necessarily give it a different bearing from that which it has in Luke. The superiority of Luke's account cannot appear doubtful to the reader who has caught the admirable connection of this discourse, and the striking meaning of all the figures which Jesus uses to compose those two scenes. As to the true position of the saying about the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, the question will be discussed chap. 12.

4th. Vers. 29–36. *The Second Discourse.*—This is the answer of Jesus to the demand which was addressed to Him to work a miracle proceeding from heaven (ver. 16). Strauss does not think that Jesus could have reverted to so secondary a question after the extremely grave charge with which He had been assailed. We have already pointed out the relation which exists between those two subjects. The miracle proceeding from heaven was claimed from Jesus as the only means He had of

clearing Himself from the suspicion of complicity with Satan. In the first part of His reply, Jesus speaks of the only sign of the kind which shall be granted to the nation (vers. 29–32); in the second, of the entire sufficiency of this sign in the case of every one who has the eye of his soul open to behold it (vers. 33–36).

Vers. 29–32.* *The Sign from Heaven.*—"And when the people thronged together, He began to say, This is an evil generation: they seek a sign; and there shall no sign be given it, but the sign of Jonas. 30. For as Jonas was a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to this generation. 31. The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation, and condemn them: for she came from the utmost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here. 32. The men of Nineveh shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here." During the previous scene, a crowd, growing more and more numerous, had gathered; and it is before it than Jesus gives the following testimony against the national unbelief. In the *πονηρά*, *wicked*, there is an allusion to the diabolical spirit which had dictated the call for a sign (*πειράζοντες*, ver. 16). The point of comparison between Jonas and Jesus, according to Luke, appears at first sight to be only the fact of their preaching, while in Matt. 12 : 39, 40 it is evidently the miraculous deliverance of the one and the *resurrection* of the other. M. Colani concludes from this difference that Matthew has materialized the comparison which Jesus gave forth in a purely moral sense (Luke).† But it must not be forgotten that Jesus says in Luke, as well as in Matthew: "The Son of man *shall be* (*ἔσται*) a sign," by which He cannot denote His present preaching and appearance, the Fut. necessarily referring to an event yet to come—an event which can be no other than the entirely exceptional miracle of His resurrection. They ask of Jesus a sign *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ*, *proceeding from heaven*, ver. 16. His resurrection, in which no human agency intervenes, and in which divine power appears alone, fully satisfies, and only satisfies, this demand. This is the feature which Peter asserts in Acts 2 : 24, 32, 3 : 15, etc.: "*God* hath raised up Jesus." In John 2 : 19, Jesus replies to a similar demand by announcing the same event. The thought in Luke and Matthew is therefore exactly the same: "It was as one who had miraculously escaped from death that Jonas presented himself before the Ninevites, summoning them to anticipate the danger which threatened them; it is as the risen One that I (by my messengers) shall proclaim salvation to the men of this generation." Which of the two texts is it which reproduces the answer of our Lord most exactly? But our passage may be parallel with Matt. 16 : 4, where the form is that of Luke. As to the words of Matt. 12 : 39, 40, they must be authentic. No one would have put into the mouth of Jesus the expression *three days and three nights*, when Jesus had actually remained in the tomb only one day and two nights.

But how shall this sign, and this preaching which will accompany it, be received? It is to this new thought that vers. 31 and 32 refer. Of the two examples which Jesus quotes, Matthew puts that of the Ninevites first, that of the Queen of Sheba second. Luke reverses the order. Here again it is easy to perceive the superiority of Luke's text. 1. Matthew's order has been determined by the natural tendency to

* Ver. 29. 5 Mjj. repeat *γενεα* after *αυτη*, read *ζητει* instead of *επιζητει*, and omit the words *του προφητου* (taken from Matthew). Ver. 32. 12 Mjj. 80 Mnn. Syr^{sch}. It. read *Νινευειται* instead of *Νινευι*.

† "Jésus Christ et les croyances Messianiques," etc., p. 111.

bring the example of the Ninevites into immediate proximity with what Jesus has been saying of Jonas. 2. Luke's order presents an admirable gradation: while the wisdom of Solomon sufficed to attract the Queen of Sheba from such a distance, Israel demands that to the infinitely higher wisdom of Jesus there should be added a sign from heaven. This is serious enough. But matters will be still worse: while the heathen of Nineveh were converted by the voice of Jonas escaped from death, Israel at the sight of Jesus raised from the dead, shall not be converted. Comp. as to the Queen of the South, 1 Kings 10 : 1 *et seq.* *Seba* seems to have been a part of Arabia-Felix, the modern Yemen. Ἐγερθήσεται, *shall rise up* from her tomb on the day of the great awakening, *at the same time as* the Jews (μετά, *with*, not *against*), so that the blindness of the latter shall appear in full light, contrasted with the earnestness and docility of the heathen queen. The word ἀνδρων, "the *men* of this generation," certainly indicates a contrast with her female sex. Indeed, this term ἄνδρες, *men*, does not reappear in the following example, where *this generation* is not compared with a woman. Perhaps the choice of the first instance was suggested to Jesus by the incident which had just taken place, vers. 27, 28. The word ἀναστήσονται, ver. 32, *shall rise up*, denotes a more advanced degree of life than ἐγερθήσονται (*shall awake*). These dead are not rising from their tombs, like the Queen of Sheba; they are already in their place before the tribunal as accusing witnesses. How dramatic is everything in the speech of Jesus! and what variety is there in the smallest details of His descriptions!

Vers. 33–36.* *The Spiritual Eye.*—"No man, when he hath lighted a candle, putteth it in a secret place, neither under the bushel, but on the candlestick, that they which come in may see the light. 34. The light of the body is the eye: therefore when thine eye is single, thy whole body also is full of light; but when thine eye is evil, thy whole body is full of darkness. 35. Take heed, therefore, that the light which is in thee be not darkness. 36. If thy whole body, therefore, be full of light, having no part dark, the whole shall be full of light, as when the bright shining of a candle doth give thee light." Christ—such is the *sign from heaven* whose light God will diffuse over the world. He is the lamp which gives light to the house. God has not lighted it to allow it to be banished to an obscure corner; He will put it on a candlestick, that it may shine before the eyes of all; and this He will do by means of the resurrection. Κρυπτήν, a place out of view, under a bed, *e.g.* (8 : 16). Τὸν μόδιον, not *a* bushel, but *the* bushel; there is but one in the house, which serves in turn as a measure, a dish, or a lantern.† But it is with this sign in relation to our soul, as with a lamp relatively to our body, ver. 34. To the light which shines without there must be a corresponding organ in the individual fitted to receive it, and which is thus, as it were, the lamp *within*. On the state of this organ depends the more or less of light which we receive from the external luminary, and which we actually enjoy. In the body this organ, which by means of the external light forms the light of the whole body, the hand, the foot, etc., is the eye; everything, there-

* Ver. 33. ℵ. B. C D. U. Γ, several Mnn. Syr. It$^{\text{aliq.}}$ omit δε after ουδεις. Instead of κρυπτον, which the T. R. reads, with some Mnn., all the other documents read κρυπτην. The MSS. are divided between το φεγγος (T. R.) and το φως (Alex.), which appears to be taken from 8 : 16. Ver. 34. 6 Alex. add σου after οφθαλμος (the first). ℵ. B. D. L. A. It. Vg. omit ουν after οταν. K. L. M. X. Π. some Mnn. It$^{\text{aliq.}}$, εσται instead of εστιν. K. M. U. X. Π. 50 Mnn. It$^{\text{plerique}}$, add εσται after σκοτεινον. Ver 35. D Syr$^{\text{cur.}}$ It$^{\text{plerique}}$, omit this verse.

† M. F. Bovet, "Voyage en Terre-Sainte," p. 312.

fore, depends on the state of this organ. For the soul it is—Jesus does not say what, He leaves us to guess—*the heart*, καρδία ; comp. Matt. 6 : 21 and 22. The understanding, the will, the whole spiritual being, is illuminated by the divine light which the heart admits With every motion in the way of righteousness there is a discharge of light over the whole soul Ἁπλοῦς, *single*, and hence in this place—which is in its original, normal state ; πονηρός, *corrupted*, and hence diseased, in the meaning of the phrase πονηρῶς ἔχειν, *to be ill*. If the Jews were right in heart, they would see the divine sign put before their eyes as easily as the Queen of the South and the Ninevites perceived the less brilliant sign placed before them ; but their heart is perverse : that organ is diseased ; and hence the sign shines, and will shine, in vain before their view. The light without will not become light *in them*.

Ver. 35. It is supremely important, therefore, for every one to watch with the greatest care over the state of this precious organ. If the eye is not enlightened, what member of the body will be so ? The foot and hand will act in the darkness of night. So with the faculties of the soul when the heart is perverted from good. Ver. 36. But what a contrast to this condition is formed by that of a being who opens his heart fully to the truth, his spiritual eye to the brightness of the lamp which has been lighted by God Himself ! To avoid the tautology which the two members of the verse seem to present, we need only put the emphasis differently in the two propositions ; in the first on ὅλον, *whole ;* and in the second on φωτεινόν, *full of light*, connecting this word immediately with the following as its commentary : *full of light as when* . . . The very position of the words forbids any other grammatical explanation ; and it leads us to this meaning : " When, through the fact of the clearness of thine eye, thy whole body shall be penetrated with light, without there being in thee the least trace of darkness, then the phenomenon which will be wrought in thee will resemble what takes place on thy body when it is placed in the rays of a luminous focus." Jesus means, that from the inward part of a perfectly sanctified man there rays forth a splendor which glorifies the external man, as when he is shone upon from without. It is glory as the result of holiness. The phenomenon described here by Jesus is no other than that which was realized in Himself on the occasion of His transfiguration, and which He now applies to all believers. Passages such as 2 Cor. 3 : 18 and Rom. 8 : 29 will always be the best commentary on this sublime declaration, which Luke alone has preserved to us, and which forms so perfect a conclusion to this discourse.

Bleek having missed the meaning of this saying, and of the piece generally, accuses Luke of having placed it here without ground, and prefers the setting which it has in Matthew, in the middle of the Sermon on the Mount, immediately after the maxim : " Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." Undoubtedly this context of Matthew proves, as we have recognized, that the eye of the soul, according to the view of Jesus, is the heart. But what disturbs the purity of that organ is not merely avarice, as would appear from the context of Matt. 6. It is sin in general, perversity of heart hostile to the light ; and this more general application is precisely that which we find in Luke. This passage has been placed in the Sermon on the Mount, like so many others, rather because of the association of ideas than from historical reminiscence. The context of Luke, from 11 : 14 to ver. 36, is without fault. On the one side the accusation and demand made by the enemies of Jesus, vers. 15, 16, on the other the enthusiastic exclamation of the believing woman, vers. 27, 28, furnish Jesus with the starting-points for His two contrasted descriptions—that of growing blindness which terminates in midnight darkness, and that of gradual illumination which leads to perfect glory. We may, after this, estimate the justness of

Holtzmann's judgment: "It is impossible to connect this passage about light, in a simple and natural way, with the discourse respecting Jonas."

8. *The Dinner at a Pharisee's House:* 11 : 37–12 : 12.—Agreeably to the connection established by Luke himself (12 : 1), we join the two pieces 11 : 37–54 and 12 : 1–12 in one whole. Here, so far as Galilee is concerned, we have the culminating point of the struggle between Jesus and the pharisaic party. This period finds its counterpart in Judea, in the scenes related John 8, 10. The background of the conflict which now ensues is still the odious accusation refuted in the previous passage. The actual situation assigned to the repast is, according to Holtzmann, merely a fiction, the idea of which had been suggested to Luke by the figures of vers. 39 and 40. Is it not more natural to suppose that the images of vers. 39 and 40 were suggested to Jesus by the actual situation, which was that of a repast? It is true, a great many of the sayings which compose this discourse are found placed by Matthew in a different connection; they form part of the great discourse in which Jesus denounced the divine malediction on the scribes and Pharisees in the temple a few days before His death (Matt. 23). But first it is to be remarked, that Holtzmann gives as little credit to the place which those sayings occupy in the composition of Matthew, as to the "scenery" of Luke. Then we have already found too many examples of the process of aggregation used in the first Gospel, to have our confidence shaken thereby in the narrative of Luke. We shall inquire, therefore, with impartiality, as we proceed, which of the two situations is that which best suits the words of Jesus.

This piece contains: 1*st.* The rebukes addressed to the Pharisees (vers. 37–44); 2*d.* Those addressed to the scribes (vers. 45–54); 3*d.* The encouragements given to the disciples in face of the animosity to which they are exposed on the part of those enraged adversaries (12 : 1–12).

1*st. To the Pharisees:* vers. 37–44.—Vers. 37 and 38.* *The Occasion.*—This Pharisee had probably been one of the hearers of the previous discourse; perhaps one of the authors of the accusation raised against Jesus. He had invited Jesus along with a certain number of his own colleagues (vers. 45 and 53), with the most malevolent intention. Thus is explained the tone of Jesus (ver 39, *et seq.*), which some commentators have pronounced impolite (!). The reading of some Fathers and Vss., "He began to *doubt* (or to *murmur*, as διακρίνεσθαι sometimes means in the LXX.), and to say," is evidently a paraphrase. Ἄριστον, the morning meal, as δεῖπνον, the principal meal of the day. The meaning of the expression εἰσελθὼν ἀνέπεσεν is this: He seated Himself without ceremony, as He was when He entered. The Pharisees laid great stress on the rite of purification before meals (Mark 7 : 2–4; Matt. 15 : 1–3), and the Rabbins put the act of eating with unwashed hands in the same category as the sin of impurity. From the surprise of His host, Jesus takes occasion to stigmatize the false devotion of the Pharisees; He does not mince matters; for after what has just passed (ver. 15), war is openly declared. He denounces: 1*st.* The hypocrisy of the Pharisees (vers 39–42); 2*d.* Their vainglorious spirit (ver. 43; 3*d.* The evil influence which their false devotion exercises over the whole people (ver. 44).

Vers. 39–42.† *Their Hypocrisy.*—"And the Lord said unto him, Now do ye Phar-

* Ver. 38. Instead of ἰδων εθαυμασεν οτι, D. Syr$^{cur.}$ It^{plerique}, Vg. Tert.: ηρξατο διακρινομενος εν εαυτω λεγειν διατι.

† Ver. 42. ℵ^{c}. B. L. 2 Mnn., παρειναι instead of αφιεναι.

isees make clean the outside of the cup and the platter ; but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness. 40. Ye fools, did not He that made that which is without, make that which is within also? 41. Rather give alms of such things as are within ; and, behold, all things are clean unto you. 42. But woe unto you, Pharisees ! for ye tithe mint and rue, and all manner of herbs, and pass over judgment and the love of God : these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone." God had appointed for His people certain washings, that they might cultivate the sense of moral purity in His presence. And this is what the Pharisees have brought the rite to ; multiplying its applications at their pleasure, they think themselves excused thereby from the duty of heart purification. Was it possible to go more directly in opposition to the divine intention : to destroy the practice of the duty by their practices, the end by the means? Meyer and Bleek translate *νῦν, now*, in the sense of time : " Things have *now* come to such a pass with you . . ." It is more natural to give it the logical sense which it often has : " Well now ! There you are, you Pharisees ! I take you in the act." If, in the second member of the verse, the term *τὸ ἔσωθεν, the inward part*, was not supplemented by *ὑμῶν, your* inward part, the most natural sense of the first member would be thus : " Ye make clean the outside of the vessels in which ye serve up the repast to your guests." Bleek maintains this meaning for the first proposition, notwithstanding the *ὑμῶν* in the second, by joining this pron. to the two substantives, *ἁρπαγῆς* and *πονηρίας* : " But the inside [of the cups and platters] is full [of the products] of *your* ravenings and *your* wickedness." But 1. This connection of *ὑμῶν* is forced ; 2. Ver. 40 does not admit of this sense, for we must understand by *Him who made both that which is without and that which is within*, the potter who made the plates, the goldsmith who fashioned the cups, which is absurd. As in ver. 40 the *ὁ ποιήσας, He that made*, is very evidently the Creator, *the inward part*, ver. 40 and ver. 39, can only be that of man, the heart. We must therefore allow an ellipsis in ver. 39, such as frequently occurs in comparisons, and by which, for the sake of conciseness, one of the two terms is suppressed in each member of the comparison : " Like a host who should set before his guests plates and cups perfectly cleansed outside, [but full of filth inside], 39*a*, ye think to please God by presenting to Him [your bodies purified by lustrations, but at the same time] your inward part full of ravening and wickedness, 39*b*." The *inward part* denotes the whole moral side of human life. Ἁρπαγή, *ravening*—avarice carried out in act ; *πονηρία, wickedness*—the inner corruption which is the source of it. Jesus ascends from sin in act to its first principle.

The apostrophe, *ye fools*, ver. 40, is then easily understood, as well as the argument on which it rests. God, who made the body, made the soul also ; the purification of the one cannot therefore, in His eyes, be a substitute for the other. A well-cleansed body will not render a polluted soul acceptable to Him, any more than a brightly polished platter will render distasteful meat agreeable to a guest ; for *God is a spirit*. This principle lays pharisaism in the dust. Some commentators have given this verse another meaning, which Luther seems to adopt : " The man who has made (pure) the outside, has not thereby made (pure) the inside." But this meaning of *ποιεῖν* is inadmissible, and the *οὐχ* heading the proposition proves that it is interrogative. The meaning of the parallel passage in Matt. 23 : 25, 26 is somewhat different : " The contents of the cup and platter must be purified by filling them only with goods lawfully acquired : in this way, the outside, should it even be indifferently cleansed, will yet be sufficiently pure." It is at bottom the same thought, but suffi-

riently modified in form, to prove that the change cannot be explained by the use of one and the same written source, but must arise from oral tradition. To the rebuke administered there succeeds the counsel, ver. 41. We have translated πλήν by *rather*. The literal sense, *excepting*, is thus explained: "All those absurdities swept away, here is *what alone remains*." At first sight, this saying appears to correspond with the idea expressed in Matthew's text, rather than with the previous saying in Luke. For the expression τὰ ἐνοντα, *that which is within*, cannot in this verse refer to the inward part *of man*, but denotes undoubtedly the contents of the cups and platters. But it is precisely because τὰ ἐνοντα, *that which is within*, is not at all synonymous with ἐσωθεν, *the inward part*, in the preceding context, that Luke has employed a different expression. Τὰ ἐνοντα, *the contents* of the cups and platters, denotes what remains in those vessels at the close of the feast. The meaning is: "Do you wish, then, that those meats and those wines should not be defiled, and should not defile you? Do not think that it is enough for you carefully to wash your hands before eating; there is a surer means: let some poor man partake of them. It is the spirit of love, O ye Pharisees, and not material lustrations, which will purify your banquets." Καὶ ἰδού, *and behold;* the result will be produced as if by the magic. Is it not selfishness which is the real pollution in the eyes of God? The δότε, *give*, is opposed to ἁρπαγή, *ravening*, ver. 39. This saying by no means includes the idea of the merit of works. Could Jesus fall into pharisaism at the very moment when He was laying it in the dust? Love, which gives value to the gift, excludes by its very nature that seeking of merit which is the essence of pharisaism.

The ἀλλά, *but*, ver. 42, sets the conduct of the Pharisees in opposition to that which has been described ver. 41, in order to condemn them by a new contrast; still, however, it is the antithesis between observances and moral obedience. Every Israelite was required to pay the tithe of his income (Lev. 27 : 30; Num. 18 : 21). The Pharisees had extended this command to the smallest productions in their gardens, such as mint, rue, and herbs, of which the law had said nothing. Matthew mentions other plants, anise and cummin (23 : 23). Could it be conceived that the one writer could have made so frivolous a change on the text of the other, or on a common document? In opposition to those pitiful returns, which are their own invention, Jesus sets the fundamental obligations imposed by the law, which they neglect without scruple. Κρίσις, *judgment:* here the discernment of what is just, the good sense of the heart, including justice and equity (Sirach 33 : 34). Matthew adds ἔλεος and πίστις, *mercy* and *faith*, and omits the love of God, which Luke gives. The two virtues indicated by the latter correspond to the two parts of the summary of the law. The moderation and wisdom of Jesus are conspicuous in the last words of the verse; He will in no wise break the old legal mould, provided it is not kept at the expense of its contents.

Ver. 43.* *Vainglory.*—"Woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye love the uppermost seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets." The uppermost seats in the synagogues were reserved for the doctors. This rebuke is found more fully developed, 20 : 45–47.

Ver. 44. *Contagious Influence.*—"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are as graves which appear not, and the men that walk over them are

* Ver. 43. ℵ. B. C. L. some Mnn. Syr^{cur}. It^{plerique}, omit γραμματεις και Φαρισαιοι υποκριται, which the T. R. here adds with the other documents (taken from Matthew).

not aware of them." Jesus by this figure describes the moral fact which He elsewhere designates as *the leaven of the Pharisees*. According to Num. 19 : 16, to touch a grave rendered a man unclean for eight days, as did the touch of a dead body. Nothing more easy, then, than for one to defile himself by touching with his foot a grave on a level with the ground, without even suspecting its existence. Such is contact with the Pharisees ; men think they have to do with saints : they yield themselves up to their influence, and become infected with their spirit of pride and hypocrisy, against which they were not put on their guard. In Matthew (23 : 27), the same figure receives a somewhat different application. A man looks with complacency at a sepulchre well built and whitened, and admires it. But when, on reflection, he says : Within there is nothing save rottenness, what a different impression does he experience ! Such is the feeling which results from observing the Pharisees. That the two texts should be borrowed from the same document, or taken the one from the other, is quite as inconceivable as it is easy to understand how oral tradition should have given to the same figure those two different applications.

2*d. To the Scribes:* vers. 45–54.—A remark made by a scribe gives a new turn to the conversation. The Pharisees were only a religious party ; but the scribes, the experts in the law, formed a profession strictly so called. They were the learned, *the wise*, who discovered nice prescriptions in the law, such as that alluded to in ver. 42, and gave them over for the observance of their pious disciples. The scribes played the part of clerical guides. The majority of them seem to have belonged to the pharisaic party ; for we meet with no others in the N. T. But their official dignity gave them a higher place in the theocracy than that of a mere party. Hence the exclamation of him who here interrupts Jesus : "Thus saying, Thou reproachest us, us scribes also," which evidently constitutes in his eyes a much graver offence than that of reproaching the Pharisees. In His answer Jesus upbraids them on three grounds, as He had done the Pharisees : 1*st*. Religious intellectualism (ver. 46) ; 2*d*. Persecuting fanaticism (vers. 47–51) ; 3*d*. The pernicious influence which they exercised on the religious state of the people (ver. 52). Ver. 53 and 54 describe the end of the feast.

Vers. 45 and 46.* *Literalism.*—"Then answered one of the lawyers, and said unto him, Master, thus saying thou reproachest us also. 46. And He said, Woe unto you also, ye lawyers ! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers." There seems to be no essential difference between the terms νομικός, νομοδιδάσκαλος, and γραμματεύς. See ver. 53 ; and comp. ver. 52 with Matt. 23 : 13. Yet there must be a shade of difference at least between the words ; according to the etymology, νομικός denotes the expert, the casuist, who discusses doubtful cases, the Mosaic jurist, as Meyer says ; νομοδιδάσκαλος, the doctor, the professor who gives public or private courses of Mosaic law ; γραμματεύς would include in general all those who are occupied with the Scriptures, either in the way of theoretical teaching or practical application.

Our Lord answers the scribe, as He had answered the Pharisee, in three sentences of condemnation. The first rebuke is the counterpart of that which He had addressed in the first place to the latter, to wit, literalism ; this is the twin brother of formalism. The paid scribes were infinitely less respectable than the generality of

* Ver. 46. G. M. some Mnn. It[plerique], Vg., ενι πω δακτυλω instead of ενι των δακτυλων.

the Pharisees. As to those minute prescriptions which they discovered daily in the law, and which they recommended to the zeal of devotees, they had small regard for them in their own practice. They seemed to imagine that, so far as they were concerned, the knowing dispensed with the doing. Such is the procedure characterized by Jesus in ver. 46. Constantly drawing the heaviest burdens from the law, they bind them on the shoulders of the simple. But as to themselves, they make not the slightest effort to lift them.

Vers. 47–51.* *Persecuting Orthodoxy.*—"Woe unto you! for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets, and your fathers killed them. 48. Truly ye are witnesses that ye allow the deeds of your fathers: for they indeed killed them, and ye build their sepulchres. 49. Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send them prophets and apostles, and some of them they shall slay and persecute: 50. That the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation; 51. From the blood of Abel, unto the blood of Zacharias, which perished between the altar and the temple: verily I say unto you, it shall be required of this generation." Head religion is almost always connected with hatred of living piety, or spiritual religion, and readily becomes persecuting. All travellers, and particularly Robinson, mention the remarkable tombs, called tombs of the prophets, which are seen in the environs of Jerusalem. It was perhaps at that time that the Jews were busied with those structures; they thought thereby to make amends for the injustice of their fathers. By a bold turn, which translates the external act into a thought opposed to its ostensible object, but in accordance with its real spirit, Jesus says to them: "Your fathers killed; ye bury; therefore ye continue and finish their work." In the received reading, *μαρτυρεῖτε, ye bear witness*, signifies: "When ye bury, ye give testimony to the reality of the bloodshed committed by your fathers." But the Alex. reading *μάρτυρές ἐστε, ye are witnesses*, is undoubtedly preferable. It includes an allusion to the official part played by witnesses in the punishment of stoning (Deut. 17 : 7; Acts 7 : 58). It is remarkable that the two terms *μάρτυς witness*, and *συνευδοκεῖν, to approve*, are also found united in the description of Stephen's martyrdom. They seem to have had a technical significance. Thus: "Ye take the part of witnesses and consummators of your fathers' crimes." The reading of the Alex., which omit *αὐτῶν τὰ μνημεῖα, their graves*, at the end of ver. 48, has a forcible conciseness. Unfortunately those MSS. with the T. R. read *αὐτούς* after *ἀπέκτειναν*; and this regimen of the first verb appears to settle that of the second. In connection with the conduct of the Jews toward their prophets, whom they slew, and honored immediately after their death, the saying has been rightly quoted: *sit licet divus, dummodo non vivus.* The parallel passage in Matthew (23 : 29–31) has a rather different sense: "Ye say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets; Wherefore ye witness against yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets." The oneness of sentiment is here proved, not by the act of building the tombs, but by the word *children.* The two forms show such a difference, that they could not proceed from one and the same document. That of Luke appears every way preferable. In Matthew, the relation between the words put by Jesus into the mouth of the Jews, ver. 30, and the building of the tombs, ver. 29, is not clear.

* Ver. 47. ℵ*. C., *και οι* instead of *οι δε*. Ver. 48. ℵ. B. L., *μαρτυρες εστε* instead of *μαρτυρειτε* (taken from Matthew). ℵ. B. D. L. It$^{aliq.}$ omit *αυτων τα μνημεια* after *οικοδομειτε*. Ver. 49. Marcion omitted vers. 49–51.

Διὰ τοῦτο καί : "And because the matter is really so, notwithstanding appearances to the contrary, the wisdom of God hath said." What does Jesus understand by the wisdom of God? Ewald, Bleek, etc., think that Jesus is here quoting a lost book, which assigned this saying to the wisdom of God, or which itself bore this title. Bleek supposes that the quotation from this book does not go further than to the ναί, ver. 51 ; the discourse of Jesus is resumed at the words, *Verily I say unto you.* But, 1. The discourses of Jesus present no other example of an extra-canonical quotation ; 2. The term *apostle,* in what follows, seems to betray the language of Jesus Himself ; 3. The thought of vers. 50 and 51 is too profound and mysterious to be ascribed to any human source whatever. According to Meyer, we have indeed a saying of Jesus here ; but as it was repeated in oral tradition, it had become a habit, out of reverence for Jesus, to quote it in this form : *The wisdom of God* (Jesus) *said, I send* . . . Comp. Matt. 23 : 34 : *I send* (ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω). This form of quotation was mistakenly regarded by Luke as forming part of the discourse of Jesus. But Luke has not made us familiar thus far with such blunders ; and the διὰ τοῦτο, *on account of this*—which falls so admirably into the context of Luke, and which is found identically in Matthew, where it has, so to speak, no meaning (as Holtzmann acknowledges, p. 228) —is a striking proof in favor of the exactness of the document from which Luke draws. Baur thinks that by the word, *the wisdom of God,* Luke means to designate the Gospel of Matthew, itself already received in the Church as God's word at the time when Luke wrote. But it must first be proved that Luke knew and used the Gospel of Matthew. Our exegesis at every step has proved the contrary ; besides, we have no example of an apostolical author having quoted the writing of one of his colleagues with such a formula of quotation. Neander and Gess think that here we have a mere parenthesis inserted by Luke, in which he reminds us in passing of a saying which Jesus in point of fact did not utter till later (Matt. 23). An interpolation of this kind is far from natural. The solitary instance which could possibly be cited (Luke 7 : 29, 30) seems to us more than doubtful.

Olshausen asserts that Jesus intends an allusion to the words (2 Chron. 24 : 19) : "He sent prophets to them, to bring them again unto Him ; but they would not receive them." But the connection between those two sayings is very indirect. I think there is a more satisfactory solution. The book of the O. T. which in the primitive Church as well as among the Jews, in common with the books of Jesus Sirach and Wisdom, bore the name of σοφία, or *wisdom of God,* was that of Proverbs.* Now here is the passage which we find in that book (1 : 20–31) : "Wisdom uttereth her voice in the streets and crieth in the chief places of concourse . . . Behold, I will pour out my Spirit upon you (LXX., ἐμῆς πνοῆς ῥῆσιν), and I will make known my words unto you . . . But ye have set at nought all my counsel, and would none of my reproof. Therefore I will laugh at your calamity, I will mock when your fear cometh . . . (and I shall say), Let them eat of the fruit of their works!" This is the passage which Jesus seems to me to quote. For the breath of His Spirit, whom God promises to send to His people to instruct and reprove them, Jesus substitutes the living organs of the Spirit—His apostles, the new prophets ; then He applies to the Jews of the day (ver. 49*b*) the sin of obstinate resistance proclaimed in the same passage ; finally (vers. 50, 51), He paraphrases the idea of final

* Clemens Rom., Irenæus, Hegesippus call it ἡ πανάρετος σοφία ; Melito (according to the reading ἡ καί, (Eus. iv. 33, ed. Læmm.) σοφία. See Wieseler, "Stud. und Kritik." 1856, 1.

punishment, which closes this prophecy. The parallelism seems to us to be complete, and justifies in the most natural manner the use of the term, *the wisdom of God*. By the words *prophets and apostles* Jesus contrasts this new race of the Spirit's agents, which is to continue the work of the old, with the men of the dead letter, with those scribes whom He is now addressing. The lot which lies before them at the hands of the latter will be precisely the same as the prophets had to meet at the hands of their fathers; thus to the sin of the fathers there will be justly added that of the children, until the measure be full. It is a law of the Divine government, which controls the lot of societies as well as that of individuals, that God does not correct a development once commenced by premature judgment. While still warning the sinner, He leaves his sin to ripen; and at the appointed hour He strikes, not for the present wickedness only, but for all which preceded. The continuous unity of the sin of the fathers involves their descendants, who, while able to change their conduct, persevere and go all the length of the way opened up by the former. This continuation on the part of the children includes an implicit assent, in virtue of which they become accomplices, responsible for the entire development. A decided breaking away from the path followed was the only thing which could avail to rid them of this terrible implication in the entire guilt. According to this law it is that Jesus sees coming on the Israel round about Him the whole storm of wrath which has gathered from the torrents of innocent blood shed since the beginning of the human race. Comp. the two threatenings of St. Paul, which look like a commentary on this passage (Rom. 2 : 3–5; 1 Thess. 2 : 15, 16).

Jesus quotes the first and last examples of martyrdoms mentioned in the canonical history of the old covenant. Zacharias, the son of the high priest Jehoiada, according to 2 Chron. 24 : 20, was stoned in the temple court by order of King Joash. As Chronicles probably formed the last book of the Jewish canon, this murder, the last related in the O. T., was the natural counterpart to that of Abel. Jesus evidently alludes to the words of Genesis (4 : 10), "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth from the ground," and to those of the dying Zacharias, "The Lord look upon it, and require it." Comp. ἐκζητηθῇ, ver. 50, and ἐκζητηθήσεται, ver. 51 (in Luke). If Matthew calls Zacharias the son of Barachias, it may be reconciled with 2 Chron. 24 by supposing that Jehoiada, who must then have been 130 years of age, was his grandfather, and that the name of his father Barachias is omitted because he had died long before. Anyhow, if there was an error, it must be charged against the compiler of the first Gospel (as is proved by the form of Luke), not against Jesus.

Ver. 52: *The Monopoly of Theology.*—"Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered." The religious despotism with which Jesus in the third place charges the scribes, is a natural consequence of their fanatical attachment to the letter. This last rebuke corresponds to the third which He had addressed to the Pharisees—the pernicious influence exercised by them over the whole people. Jesus represents *knowledge* (γνῶσις) under the figure of a temple, into which the scribes should have led the people, but whose gate they close, and hold the key with jealous care. This knowledge is not that of the gospel, a meaning which would lead us outside the domain of the scribes; it is the real living knowledge of God, such as might already be found, at least to a certain extent, in the O. T. The key is the Scriptures, the interpretation of which the scribes reserved exclusively to themselves. But their commentaries, instead of tearing aside the veil of the letter, that their hear-

ers might penetrate to the spirit, thickened it, on the contrary, as if to prevent Israel from beholding the face of the living God who revealed Himself in the O. T., and from coming into contact with Him The pres. part. *εἰσερχόμενοι* denotes those who were ready to rise to this vital knowledge, and who only lacked the sound interpretation of Scripture to bring them to it.

Matthew, in a long discourse which he puts into the mouth of Jesus in the temple (chap. 23), has combined in one compact mass the contents of those two apostrophes addressed to the Pharisees and lawyers, which are so nicely distinguished by Luke. Jesus certainly uttered in the temple, as Matthew relates, a vigorous discourse addressed to the scribes and Pharisees. Luke himself (20 : 45–47) indicates the time, and gives a summary of it. But it cannot be doubted that here, as in the Sermon on the Mount, the first Gospel has combined many sayings uttered on different occasions. The distribution of accusations between the Pharisees and lawyers, as we find it in Luke, corresponds perfectly to the characters of those two classes. The question of the scribe (ver. 45) seems to be indisputably authentic. Thus Luke shows himself here again the historian properly so called.

Vers. 53 and 54.* *Historical Conclusion.*—These verses describe a scene of violence, perhaps unique, in the life of Jesus. Numerous variations prove the very early alteration of the text. According to the reading of the principal Alex., *And when He had gone thence*, this scene must have taken place after Jesus had left the Pharisee's house ; but this reading seems designed to establish a closer connection with what follows (12 : 1, *et seq.*), and produces the impression of a gloss. On the other hand, the omission of the words, *and seeking*, and *that they might accuse Him*, in B. L. (ver. 54), renders the turn of expression more simple and lively. The reading *ἀποστομίζειν* (*to blunt*) has no meaning. We must read *ἀποστοματίζειν*, *to utter*, and then *to cause to utter.*

3*d*. *To the Disciples :* 12 : 1–12.—This violent scene had found its echo outside ; a considerable crowd had flocked together. Excited by the animosity of their chiefs, the multitude showed a disposition hostile to Jesus and His disciples. Jesus feels the need of turning to His own, and giving them, in presence of all, those encouragements which their situation demands. Besides, He has uttered a word which must have gone to their inmost heart, *some of you they will slay and persecute*, and He feels the need of supplying some counterpoise. Thus is explained the exhortation which follows, and which has for its object to raise their courage and give them boldness in testifying. Must not one be very hard to please, to challenge, as Holtzmann does, the reality of a situation so simple ?

Jesus encourages His apostles : 1*st*. By the certainty of the success of their cause (vers. 1–3) ; 2*d*. By the assurance which He gives them as to their persons (vers. 4–7) ; 3*d*. By the promise of a glorious recompense, which He contrasts with the punishment of the timid, and of their adversaries (vers. 8–10) ; *finally*, By the assurance of powerful aid (vers. 11, 12).

Vers. 1–3 :† *The Assured Success of their Ministry, and the Fall of their Adver-*

* Ver. 53. ℵ. B. C. L. read *κακειθεν εξελθοντος αυτου* instead of *λεγοντος . . . αυτους*. L. S. V. Δ. several Mnn., *αποστομιζειν* instead of *αποστοματιζειν*. Ver. 54. ℵ. X. omit *αυτον* after *ενεδρευοντες*. 15 Mjj. Syr. It. read *ζητουντες* instead of *και ζητουντες* ; ℵ. B. L. omit these words. ℵ. B. L. omit *να κατηγορησωσιν αυτου*.

† Ver. 1. Instead of *εν οις . . . οχλων*, D. It$^{\text{plerique}}$, Vg., *πολλων δε οχλων συνιπερ ιεχοντων κυκλω*. Tert. Vg. omit *πρωτον*.

saries.—" In the mean time, when there were gathered together an innumerable multitude of people, insomuch that they trode one upon another, He began to say unto His disciples first of all: Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy. 2. For there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed; neither hid, that shall not be known. 3. Therefore, whatsoever ye have spoken in darkness shall be heard in the light; and that which ye have spoken in the ear in closets shall be proclaimed upon the house-tops." The words ἐν οἷς, *on which*, establish a close connection between the following scene and that which precedes. This gathering, which is formed as in the previous scene (11 : 29), is readily explained by the general circumstances—those of a journey. When Jesus had arrived at a village, some time was needed to make the population aware of it; and soon it flocked to Him *en masse*. Ἤρξατο, *He began*, imparts a solemn character to the words which follow. Jesus, after having spoken severely to His adversaries, now addresses the little company of His disciples, lost among that immense throng, in language full of boldness. It is the cry *onward*, with the promise of victory. The words, *to the disciples*, are thus the key to the discourse following. The word πρῶτον, *before all*, should evidently be connected with the verb which follows, *beware ye*. Comp. 9 : 61, 10 : 5. Meyer concludes, from the absence of the article before ὑπόκρισις, that the leaven is not hypocrisy itself, but a style of teaching which has the character of hypocrisy. This is a very forced meaning. The absence of the article is very common before terms which denote virtues and vices. (Winer, "Gramm. des N. T. Sprachidioms," § 19, 1.) Leaven is the emblem of every active principle, good or bad, which possesses the power of assimilation. The devotion of the Pharisees had given a false direction to the whole of Israelitish piety (vers. 39, 44). This warning may have been repeated several times (Mark 8 : 13; Matt. 16 : 6).

The δέ adversative of ver. 2 determines the sense of the verse: "But all this pharisaic hypocrisy shall be unveiled. The impure foundation of this so vaunted holiness shall come fully to the light, and then the whole authority of those masters of opinion shall crumble away; but, *in place thereof* (ἀνθ' ὧν, ver. 3), those whose voice cannot now find a hearing, save within limited and obscure circles, shall become the teachers of the world." The Hillels and Gamaliels will give place to new teachers, who shall fill the world with their doctrine, and those masters shall be Peter, John, Matthew, here present! This substitution of a new doctorate for the old is announced in like manner to Nicodemus (John 3 : 10, 11). Here, as there, the poetical rhythm of the parallelism indicates that elevation of feeling which arises from so great and transporting a thought. Comp. the magnificent apostrophe of St. Paul, 1 Cor. 1 : 20: "Where is the wise? Where is the scribe . . .?" By St. Paul's time the substitution had been fully effected. Ταμεῖον, *the larder* (from τέμνω); and hence the locked chamber, the innermost apartment, in opposition to the public room. The roofs of houses in the East are terraces, from which one can speak with those who are in the street. This is the emblem of the greatest possible publicity. The mouth of the scribes shall be stopped, and the teaching of the poor disciples shall be heard over the whole universe. The apophthegms of vers. 2 and 3 may be applied in many ways, and Jesus seems to have repeated them often with varied applications. Comp. 8 : 17. In the parallel passage (Matt. 10 : 27), the matter in question is the teaching of Jesus, not that of the apostles; and this saying appears in the form of an exhortation addressed to the latter: "What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light." Naturally the maxim which precedes (ver. 2 of Luke) should also receive a

different application in Matthew (ver. 26): "Everything that is true must come to the light. Publish, therefore, without fear whatsoever I have told you."

Vers. 4–7.* *Personal Security.*—"And I say unto you, my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. 5. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear; fear Him which, after He hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear Him. 6. Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings; and not one of them is forgotten before God? 7. But even the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not, therefore: ye are of more value than many sparrows." The success of their cause is certain. But what of their personal future? After 11 : 49 there was good cause for some disquiet on this point. Here the heart of Jesus softens: the thought of the lot which some of them will have to undergo seems to render His own more dear to Him. Hence the tender form of address, *To you, my friends.* Certainly Luke did not invent this word: and if Matthew, in whom it is not found (10 . 28, *et seq.*), had used the same document as Luke, he would not have omitted it. Olshausen has taken up the strange idea, that by him who can cast into hell we are to understand, not God, but the devil, as if Scripture taught us to fear the devil, and not rather to resist him to his face (1 Pet. 5 : 9; James 4 : 7). The MSS. are divided between the forms ἀποκτεννόντων (Eolico-Doric, according to Bleek), ἀποκτενόντων (a corruption of the preceding), and ἀποκτεινόντων (the regular form). The term *Gehenna* (hell) properly signifies *valley of Hinnom* (גי הנם, Josh. 15 : 8, comp. 18 : 16; 2 Kings 23 : 10; Jer. 7 : 31, etc.). It was a fresh and pleasant valley to the south of the hill of Zion, where were found in early times the king's gardens. But as it was there that the worship of Moloch was celebrated under the idolatrous kings, Josiah converted it into a place for sewage. The valley thus became the type, and its name the designation, of hell. This saying of Jesus distinguishes soul from body as emphatically as modern spiritualism can do. What are we to think of M. Rénan, who dares to assert that Jesus did not know the exact distinction between those two elements of our being!

Jesus does not promise His disciples that their life shall always be safe. But if they perish, it will not be without the consent of an all-powerful Being, who is called their Father. The sayings which follow express by the most forcible emblems the idea of a providence which extends to the smallest details of human life. To make a more appreciable sum, Luke speaks of five birds of the value of about two farthings. Matthew, who speaks of two birds only, gives their value at one farthing; that is, a little dearer. Did five cost proportionally a little less than two? Can we imagine one of the two evangelists amusing himself by making such changes in the text of the other, or in that of a common document! The expression *before God* is Hebraistic; it means that there is not one of those small creatures which is not individually present to the view of divine omniscience. The knowledge of God extends not only to our persons, but even to the most insignificant parts of our being—to those 140,000 hairs of which we lose some every day without paying the least attention. No fear, then; ye shall not fall without God's consent; and if He consent, it is because it will be for His child's good.

Vers. 8–10.† *The Recompense of faithful Disciples, contrasted with the Punishment*

* Ver. 4. 5 Mjj. 10 Mnn. read περισσον instead of περισσοτερον. Ver. 7. B. L. R. It^{aliq}. omit ουν after μη. 6 Mjj. 60 Mnn. Vg. add υμεις after διαφερετε (taken from Matthew).

† Ver. 8. ℵ. D. read οτι after υμιν. Marcion omitted των αγγελων. Ver. 9. A. D. K. Q. Π. 20 Mnn., εμπροσ εν instead of the first ενωπιον (according to Matthew)

of the Cowardly, and with that of Adversaries.—"Also I say unto you, Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God. 9. But he that denieth me before men, shall be denied before the angels of God. 10. And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven." The profession of the gospel may undoubtedly cost the disciples dear; but if they persevere, it assures them of a magnificent recompense. Jesus, when glorified, will requite them by declaring them *His* before the heavenly throng, for what they did for Him by acknowledging Him *their Lord* below at the time of His humiliation. The gnostic Heracleon remarked the force of the prep. ἐν with ὁμολογεῖν. It expresses the rest of faith *in* Him who is confessed. Ver. 9 guards the disciples against the danger of denial. This warning was by no means out of place at the time when they were surrounded by furious enemies. It is to be remarked that Jesus does not say *He will deny* the renegade, as He said that *He would confess* the confessor. The verb is here in the passive, as if to show that this rejection will be a self-consummated act.

Ver. 10 glances at a danger more dreadful still than that of being rejected as a timid disciple. This punishment may have an end. But the sin of which ver. 10 speaks is forever unpardonable. This terrible threat naturally applies to the sin of the adversaries of Jesus, to which His thought recurs in closing. They sin, not through timidity, but through active malice. By the expression *blaspheme against the Holy Spirit* Jesus alludes to the accusation which had given rise to this whole conflict (11 : 15), and by which the works of that divine agent in the hearts of men (comp. Matt. 12 : 28, "If I cast out devils *by the Spirit of God*") had been ascribed to the spirit of darkness. That was knowingly and deliberately to insult the holiness of the principle from which all good in human life proceeds. To show the greatness of this crime of high treason, Jesus compares it with an outrage committed against His own person. He calls the latter a simple *word* (λόγον), an imprudent word, not a *blasphemy*. To utter a word against the poor and humble Son of man is a sin which does not necessarily proceed from malice. Might it not be the position of a sincerely pious Jew, who was still ruled by prejudices with which he had been imbued by his pharisaic education, to regard Jesus not as the expected Messiah, but as an enthusiast, a visionary, or even an impostor? Such a sin resembles that of the woman who devoutly brought her contribution to the pile of Huss, and at the sight of whom the martyr exclaimed, *Sancta simplicitas*. Jesus is ready to pardon in this world or in the next every indignity offered merely to His person; but an insult offered to goodness as such, and to its living principle in the heart of humanity, the Holy Spirit, the impious audacity of putting the holiness of His works to the account of the spirit of evil—that is what He calls *blaspheming the Holy Spirit*, and what He declares unpardonable. The history of Israel has fully proved the truth of this threatening. This people perished not for having nailed Jesus Christ to the cross. Otherwise Good Friday would have been the day of their judgment, and God would not have continued to offer them for forty years the pardon of their crime. It was its rejection of the apostolic preaching, its obstinate resistance to the Spirit of Pentecost, which filled up the measure of Jerusalem's sin. And it is with individuals as with that nation. The sin which is forever unpardonable, is not the rejection of the truth, in consequence of a misunderstanding, such as that of so many unbelievers who confound the gospel with this or that false form, which is nothing better

than its caricature. It is hatred of holiness as such—a hatred which leads men to make the gospel a work of pride or fraud, and to ascribe it to the spirit of evil. This is not to sin against Jesus personally ; it is to insult the divine principle which actuated Him. It is hatred of goodness itself in its supreme manifestation.

The form in which Matthew (12 : 31, 32) has preserved this warning differs considerably from that of Luke ; and that of Mark (3 : 28, 29) differs in its turn from that of Matthew. It is wholly inconceivable, that in a statement of such gravity the evangelists arbitrarily introduced changes into a written text which they had before their eyes. On the contrary, we can easily understand how this saying, while circulating in the churches in the shape of oral tradition, assumed somewhat different forms. As to the place assigned to this declaration by the synoptics, that which Matthew and Mark give, immediately after the accusation which called it forth, appears at first sight preferable. Nevertheless, the connection which it has in Luke's context with what precedes and what follows, is not difficult to apprehend. There is at once a gradation in respect of the sin of weakness mentioned ver. 9, and a contrast to the promise of vers. 11 and 12, where this Holy Spirit, the subject of blasphemy on the part of the Pharisees, is presented as the powerful support of the persecuted disciples. There is thus room for doubt.

Vers. 11 and 12.* *The Aid.*—"When they bring you unto the synagogues, and before magistrates and powers, take ye no thought how or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say : 12. For the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say." Jesus seems to take pleasure in enumerating all the different kinds of powers whose hostility they shall have to feel. Συναγωγαί, the Jewish tribunals, having a religious character ; ἀρχαί, Gentile authorities, purely civil, from provincial prefects up to the emperor ; ἐξουσίαι, any power whatsoever. But let them not make preparation to plead ! Their answer will be supplied to them on the spot, both as to its form (πῶς, *how*) and substance (τί, *what*). And their part will not be confined to defending themselves ; they will take the offensive ; they will bear testimony (τι εἴπητε, *what ye shall say*). In this respect, also, everything shall be given them. Witness Peter and Stephen before the Sanhedrim, St. Paul before Felix and Festus ; they do not merely defend their person ; they preach the gospel. Thus the Holy Spirit will so act in them, that they shall only have to yield themselves to Him as His mouthpiece. The parallel passage occurs in Matthew in the instructions given to the Twelve (10 : 19, 20). The form is different enough to prove that the two compilations are not founded on the same text. Comp. also a similar thought (John 15 : 26, 27). This saying attests the reality of the psychological phenomenon of inspiration. Jesus asserts that the spirit of God can so communicate with the spirit of man, that the latter shall be only the organ of the former.

Holtzmann sees in all those sayings, 12 : 1–12, only a combination of materials arbitrarily connected by Luke, and placed here in a fictitious framework. A discourse specially addressed to the disciples seems to him out of place in the midst of this crowd (p. 94). Yet he cannot help making an exception of vers. 1–3, which may be regarded as suitably spoken before a large multitude. But if we admit ever so little the historical truth of the striking words, *I say unto you, you my friends* (ver.

* Ver. 11. ℵ. B. L. X. some Mnn. It^{aliq} Vg., εισφερωσιν instead of προσφερωσιν. D. It$^{aliq.}$, φερωσιν. ℵ. D. R. some Mnn., εις instead of επι. ℵ. B. L. Q. R. X. some Mnn., μεριμνησητε instead of μεριμνατε. D. Syr. It^{plerique}, omit η τι.

4), we must acknowledge that they serve to distinguish the disciples from other persons present, and who are not of the same mind. The promise addressed to faithful confessors (ver. 9) also receives from the hostile surroundings a quite peculiar appropriateness. The threat of ver. 10 supposes the presence of adversaries who have calumniated Jesus. In short, the announcement of persecutions, and the promise of the Holy Spirit's aid, vers. 11, 12, find a natural explanation it, at the very moment, the disciples were in a perilous situation. All the elements of this discourse are thus in perfect keeping with the historical frame in which it is set by Luke. And this frame is only an invention of the evangelist!

9. *The Position of Man and of the Believer in relation to this World's Goods:* 12 : 13–59.—The occasion of this new discourse is supplied by an unexpected event, and without any relation to what had just happened. This piece embraces : 1*st*. A historical introduction (vers. 13, 14) ; 2*d*. A discourse addressed by Jesus to the multitude on the value of earthly goods to man in general (vers. 15–21) ; 3*d*. A discourse, which He addresses specially to the disciples, on the position which their new faith gives them in respect of those goods (vers. 22–40) ; 4*th*. A still more special application of the same truth to the apostles (vers. 41–53) ; 5*th*. In closing, Jesus returns to the people, and gives them a last warning, based on the threatening character of present circumstances (vers. 54–59).

1*st*. *The Occasion:* vers. 13 and 14.*—A man in the crowd profits by a moment of silence to submit a matter to Jesus which lies heavily on his heart, and which probably brought him to the Lord's presence. According to the civil law of the Jews, the eldest brother received a double portion of the inheritance, burdened with the obligation of supporting his mother and unmarried sisters. As to the younger members, it would appear from the parable of the prodigal son that the single share of the property which accrued to them was sometimes paid in money. This man was perhaps one of those younger members, who was not satisfied with the sum allotted to him, or who, after having spent it, still claimed, under some pretext or other, a part of the patrimony. As on other similar occasions (the woman taken in adultery), Jesus absolutely refuses to go out of His purely spiritual domain, or to do anything which might give Him the appearance of wishing to put Himself in the place of the powers that be. The answer to the τίς, *who?* is this : neither God nor men. The difference between the judge and the μεριστής, him who divides, is that the first decides the point of law, and the second sees the sentence executed. The object of Jesus in this journey being to take advantage of all the providential circumstances which could not fail to arise, in order to instruct the people and His disciples, He immediately uses this to bring before the different classes of His hearers those solemn truths which are called forth in His mind by the unexpected event.

Holtzmann is obliged to acknowledge the reality of the fact mentioned in the introduction. He therefore alleges that in this special case the common source of Matthew and Luke contained a historical preface, and that the latter has preserved it to us, such as it was. We accept for Luke the homage rendered in this case to his fidelity. But, 1*st*. With what right can it be pretended that we have here something exceptional? 2*d*. How can it be alleged that the occasion of the following discourse was expressly indicated in the Logia, and that, nevertheless, in the face of this precise datum, the author of the first Gospel allowed himself to distribute the discourse as follows : two fragments (vers. 22–31, and 33, 34) in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 6 : 25–33, 19–21) ; another fragment (vers. 51–53) in the installation discourse

* Ver. 14 ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn. read κριτην instead of δικαστην (perhaps following Acts 7 : 27, 35, Tischendorf).

to the Twelve (Matt. 10: 34–36); finally, various passages in the great eschatological discourse (Matt. 24 and 25)? Weizsäcker feels the impossibility of such a procedure. According to him, Matthew has preserved to us the form of the discourse exactly as it appeared in the Logia. But what does Luke in his turn do? Drawing from those great discourses of the Logia the materials which suit him, he forms a new one, purely fanciful, at the head of which he sets as the origin a historical anecdote of his own invention! In what respect is this procedure better than that which Holtzmann ascribes to Matthew? Such are the psychological monstrosities in opposite directions to which men are reduced by the hypothesis of a common document.

2*d. To the People:* vers. 15–21.* *The Rich Fool.*—Πρὸς αὐτούς ("He said unto them"), ver. 15, stands in opposition to *His disciples*, ver. 22. This slight detail confirms the exactness of Luke, for faith is nowhere supposed in those to whom the warning, vers. 15–21, is addressed. The two imperatives *take heed* and *beware* might be regarded as expressing only one idea: "Have your eyes fully open to this enemy, avarice;" but they may be translated thus: "Take heed [to this man] and beware." Jesus would set him as an example before the assembled people. The Greek term, which we translate by *covetousness*, denotes the desire of having, much more than that of keeping what we have. But the second is included in the first. Both rest on a superstitious confidence in worldly goods, which are instinctively identified with happiness. But to enjoy money there is a condition, viz., life, and this condition is not guaranteed by money. Περισσεύειν, the surplus of what one has beyond what he needs. The prep. ἐν may be paraphrased by *though* or *because:* "Though he has or because he has superabundance, he has not for all that assurance of life." The two senses come nearly to the same. We should probably read πάσης, *all* covetousness, instead of τῆς, covetousness *in general:* the desire of having in every shape.

Ver. 16. The term parable may signify an example as well as an image; when the example is fictitious it is invented as an image of the abstract truth. This rich farmer has a superabundance of goods sufficient for years; but all in vain, his superfluity cannot guarantee his life even till to-morrow. He speaks to *his soul* (נֶפֶשׁ), the seat of his affections, as if it belonged to him ("my soul;" comp. the four μοῦ, vers. 17 and 18); and yet he is about to learn that this soul itself is only lent him. The words: "God said unto him," express more than a decree; they imply a warning which he hears inwardly before dying. The subject of ἀπαιτοῦσιν (the present designates the immediate future) is neither murderers nor angels; it is the indefinite pron. *on, they*, according to a very common Aramaic form; comp. ver. 48 and 14: 35. *This night* is the antithesis of *many years*, as *required* is that of the expression, "*my* soul."

Ver. 21. Application of the Parable. The phrase *laying up treasure for himself* is sufficiently explained by ver. 19. *Rich toward God* might signify, rich in spiritual goods. But the prep. εἰς, *in relation to*, is unfavorable to this meaning. It is better to take it in the sense of laying up a treasure in the presence of God, in the sense of the saying, *He who giveth to the poor lendeth to the Lord.* To become God's creditor, is to have a treasure in God; comp. vers. 33, 34.

3*d. To the Disciples:* vers. 22–40.—Disengagement from earthly goods. The fol-

* Ver. 15. 13 Mjj. 40 Mnn. Syr. It. Vg., πασης instead of της, which the T. R. reads with 9 Byz. and the Mnn. 7 Mjj. (Byz.) 60 Mnn., αυτω instead of αυτου after ζωη. The MSS. are divided between αυτου (T. R.) and αυτω after υπαρχοντων. Ver. 18. ℵ. D. some Mnn. Syr$^{cur.}$ It^{plerique}, omit και τα αγαθα μου. Ver. 20. 13 Mjj. (Alex.) several Mnn., αφρων instead of αφρον.

lowing exhortations suppose faith. The believer should renounce the pursuit of earthly goods: 1. From a feeling of entire confidence as to this life in his heavenly Father (vers. 22–34); 2. From his preoccupation with spiritual goods, after which exclusively he aspires, and because he is awaiting the return of the Master to whom he has given himself (vers. 35–40).

Vers. 22–24 * Disengagement as resulting from confidence in the omnipotence and fatherly goodness of God. "And He said unto His disciples, Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat; neither for the body, what ye shall put on. 23. The life is more than meat, and the body is more than raiment. 24. Consider the ravens: for they neither sow nor reap, which neither have storehouse nor barn; and God feedeth them: how much more are ye better than the fowls?" The words *unto His Disciples*, ver. 22, are the key of this discourse; it is only to believers that Jesus can speak as He proceeds to do. Not only should the believer not aim at possessing superabundance, he should not even disquiet himself about the necessaries of life. Of the family of God (ver. 34), the disciples of Jesus may reckon on the tender care of this heavenly Master in whose service they are working, and that in respect of food as well as clothing. *Therefore:* because this false confidence in riches is folly. Ver. 22 formally states the precept; ver. 23 gives its logical proof; ver. 24 illustrates it by an example taken from nature. The logical proof rests on an argument *à fortiori:* He who gave the more (the life, the body), will yet more certainly give the less (the nourishment of the life, the clothing of the body). In the example borrowed from nature, it is important to mark how all the figures employed—sowing, reaping, storehouse, barn—are connected with the parable of the foolish rich man. All those labors, all those provisions, in the midst of which the rich man died, the ravens know nothing of them; and yet they live! The will of God is thus a surer guarantee of existence than the possession of superabundance. In the Sermon on the Mount, where Matthew has those sayings, they occur apart from any connection with the parable of the foolish rich man, of whom there is no mention whatever. Again, a flower torn from its stalk (see on Luke 11: 5–10). It is certainly not Luke who has cleverly imagined the striking connection between this example and the preceding parable. It must therefore have existed in his sources. But if those sources were the same as those of Matthew, the latter must then have had such gross unskilfulness as to break a connection like this! In the last words, the adverb μᾶλλον, joined to διαφέρειν, which by itself signifies *to be better*, is a pleonasm having the meaning: to surpass in the highest degree. In contrast with divine power, Jesus sets human powerlessness, as proved by the sudden death of the rich man, which completes the proof of the folly of earthly cares.

Vers. 25–28.† "Which of you, with taking thought, can add to his stature one cubit? 26. If ye then be not able to do that thing which is least, why take ye thought for the rest? 27. Consider the lilies how they grow: they toil not, they spin not; and yet I say unto you, that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. 28. If then God so clothe the grass, which is to-day in the field, and to morrow is cast into the oven; how much more you, O ye of little faith?" Ver. 25

* Ver. 22. ℵ. A. B. D. L. Q. 10 Mnn. It^{plerique}, omit υμων after ψυχη. Ver. 23. 7 Mjj. 25 Mnn. Syr. It$^{aliq.}$ add γαρ after η.

† Ver. 25. ℵ. B. D. It$^{aliq.}$ omit ενα after πηχυν. Ver. 26. ℵ. B. L. Q. T. some Mnn. ουδε instead of ουτε. Ver. 27. D. Syr$^{cur.}$ has πως ουτε νηθει ουτε υφαινει instead of πως αυξανει ου κοπια ουδε νηθει. Ver. 28. B. D. L. T., αμφιεζει instead of αμφιεννυσι.

expresses in a general way the idea of the inefficacy of human cares. Μεριμνῶν, participle present : by means of disquieting one's self. Ἡλικία might refer to age ; we should then require to take πῆχυς, *cubit*, in a figurative sense (Ps. 39 : 6). But the word seems to us to be connected with what is said about the growth of plants, which is sometimes so rapid ; it is therefore more natural to give ἡλικία its ordinary sense of stature. Πῆχυς, *cubit*, thus preserves its literal meaning. Plants which give themselves no care, yet make enormous increase, while ye by your anxieties do not in the least hasten your growth. Vers. 25, 26 correspond to ver. 23. Your anxieties will not procure for you an increase of stature ; how much less advantages of higher value ! The example which follows, taken from nature (ver. 27), corresponds with that of ver. 24. After reading the delicious piece of M. F. Bovet ("Voyage en Terre-Sainte," p. 383), it is hard to give up the idea that by the *lily of the fields* we are to understand the beautiful red anemone (*anemone coronaria*) with which the meadows throughout all Palestine are enamelled. Yet Jesus may possibly mean either the magnificent white lily (*lilium candidum*), or the splendid red lily (*lilium rubrum*), which are found, though more rarely, in that country (Winer, Lexicon, ad h. v.). From want of wood, ovens in the East are fed with herbs.

Vers. 29–34.* *The Application.*—"And seek not ye what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, neither be ye of doubtful mind. 30. For all these things do the nations of the world seek after : and your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things. 31. But rather seek ye the kingdom of God ; and all these things shall be added unto you. 32. Fear not, little flock ; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom. 33. Sell that ye have, and give alms ; provide yourselves bags which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth. 34. For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." With the cares which He leaves to the men of this world (vers. 29, 30) Jesus contrasts the care which He recommends to His own (vers. 31–34).† Καί (ver. 29) : and consequently. Ὑμεῖς, *ye*, might contrast men with the lower creatures cited as examples, the ravens, the lilies. But according to ver. 30, this pronoun rather serves to distinguish the disciples from men who have no faith, from the nations of this world. Jesus thus designates not only the heathen—in that case He would have said simply *the nations*—but also the Jews, who, by refusing to enter into the βασιλεία, condemn themselves to become a people of this world like the rest, and remain outside of the true people of God, to whom Jesus is here speaking (*the little flock*, ver. 32).

Πλήν (ver. 31) : "All this false seeking swept away, there remains only one which is worthy of you." "The kingdom of God," as always : that state, first internal, then social, in which the human will is nothing but the free agent of the divine will. *All these things*, to wit, food and clothing, shall be given over and above the kingdom which ye seek exclusively, as earthly blessings were given to the young Solomon over and above the wisdom which alone he had asked. Καί : and on this single condition. Πάντα was easily omitted after ταῦτα by a mistake of sight (confusion of the two τα). Bleek acknowledges that this passage is more suitably put in Luke than by Matthew in the Sermon on the Mount, where the entire piece on confidence is only

* Ver. 29. The MSS. are divided between η τι (T. R.) and και τι (Alex.). Ver. 31. ℵ. B. D. L. It$^{aliq.}$, αυτου instead of του Θεου (which is perhaps taken from Matthew). 10 Mjj. 30 Mnn. Syr$^{cur.}$. It$^{aliq.}$ omit παντα

† Keim, vol. ii. p. 27.

very indirectly connected with the charge of covetousness addressed to the Pharisees.

The expression *little flock*, ver. 32, corresponds with the critical position of the small group of disciples in the midst of undecided or hostile myriads, ver. 1; it recalls the *you, my friends*, ver. 4. Jesus here gives consolation to the believer for times when the interests of the kingdom of God place him in a position of earthly privation (Gess). The *à fortiori* argument of ver. 23 is here, ver. 32, reproduced in a higher sphere: "Will not He who has provided with so much love for your eternal well-being provide more certainly still for your poor earthly maintenance?" What faithful servant would have to disquiet himself about his food in the house of the master for whom he works day and night? And when this master is a Father! It was from experience that Jesus spoke in such a style.

From the duty of being unconcerned about the acquisition of riches, Jesus passes, ver. 33, to that of their wise employment when they are possessed. This precept constitutes, according to De Wette, the great heresy of Luke, or, according to Keim, that of his Ebionite document—salvation by the meritorious virtue of voluntary poverty and almsgiving. But let us first remark that we have here to do with believers, who as such already possess the kingdom (ver. 32), and do not require to merit it. Then, when Jesus says *sell, give* . . . is it a commandment? Is it not the sense rather: "Have no fear; only do so! If you do, you will find it again" Finally, for a member of the society of believers at this period, was not the administration of earthly property a really difficult thing? Was not every disciple more or less in the position of Jesus Himself, who, having once begun His ministry, had required to break off His trade as a carpenter? The giving away of earthly goods is here presented, first as a means of personal emancipation, that the giver might be able to accompany Jesus, and become one of the instruments of His work; then as a gladsome liberality proceeding from love, and fitted to enrich our heaven eternally. In all this there is nothing peculiar to Luke, nor to his alleged Ebionite document. Comp. in respect of the first aspect, the history of the rich young man (in the three Syn.); and, in respect to the second, the word of Jesus in Matthew: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least . . . ye have done it unto me," and the whole of the judgment scene (Matt. 25: 31–46).

It must not be forgotten that the kingdom of God at this period was identified with the person of Jesus, and the society of disciples who accompanied Him. To follow Jesus (literally) in His peregrinations was the only way of possessing this treasure, and of becoming fit to spread it in consequence. Then, as we have seen, it was an army not merely of believers, but of evangelists, that Jesus was now laboring to form. If they had remained attached to the soil of their earthly property, they would have been incapable of following and serving Him without looking backward (9: 62). The essential character of such a precept alone is permanent. The form in which Jesus presented it arose from the present condition of the kingdom of God. The mode of fulfilling it varies. There are times when, to disentangle himself and practise Christian love, the believer must give up everything; there are other times when, to secure real freedom and be the better able to give, he must keep and administer. When Paul thus expressed the Christian duty, *possessing as though they possessed not* (1 Cor. 7: 29), it is evident that all he had in view was the disengaged and charitable spirit commended by Jesus, and that he modified the transient form which this precept had assumed. There is in the expressions of Jesus a sort of enthusiasm

of disdain for those earthly treasures in which the natural man places his happiness : "Get rid of those goods ; by giving them away, change them into heavenly treasures, and ye shall have made a good bargain !" This is the *being rich toward God* (ver. 21). Every gift made by human love constitutes in the eyes of God the impersonation of love, a debt payable in heaven. Love regards love with affection, and will find means to requite it.

By this mode of acting, the believer finds that he has a treasure in heaven. Now it is a law of psychology (ver. 34) that the heart follows the treasure ; so, your treasure once put in God, your heart will rise unceasingly toward Him. This new attitude of the believer, who lives here below with the eye of his heart turned heavenward, is what Jesus describes in the sequel. The heart, once set free from its earthly burden, will live on the new attachment to which it is given up, and on the expectation with which it is thus inspired (vers. 35–38)

Vers. 35–38.* *The Parable of the Master returning to his House.*—"Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning ; 36 And ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord, when he will return from the wedding ; that, when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately 37 Blessed are those servants whom the lord when he cometh shall find watching : verily I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them. 38. And if he shall come in the second watch, or come in the third watch, and find them so, blessed are those servants" Ver. 35. The long Oriental robe requires to be taken up, and the skirt fastened under the girdle, to allow freedom in walking (17 : 8). If it is night, it is further required that one have a lighted lamp in his hand, to walk quickly and surely to his destination. Those two figures are so thoroughly in keeping with the position of the servant spoken of in the following verses that we have no doubt about ver. 35 forming part of the parable, vers. 36–38. The faithful believer is described as a servant waiting over night for the arrival of his master who is returning from a journey That there may be no delay in opening the door when he shall knock, he keeps himself awake, up and ready to run. The lighted lamp is at his hand ; he has even food ready against the time of his return. And it matters not though the return is delayed, delayed even to the morning ; he does not yield to fatigue, but persists in his waiting attitude. Ὑμεῖς, *ye* (ver. 36), your whole person, in opposition to the lighted lamps and girded loins. The word γάμοι, *marriage*, might here have the sense of *banquet*, which it sometimes has (Esth. 2 : 18 ; 9 : 22 ; and perhaps Luke 14 : 8). It is more natural to keep the ordinary sense, only observing that the marriage in question is not that of the master himself, but a friend's, in which he is taking part. What does the master do when received in this way? Moved by such fidelity, instead of seating himself at the table prepared, he causes his devoted servants to seat themselves, and, girding himself as they were girded, he approaches them (παρελθών) to serve them, and presents them with the food which they have prepared for him. And the longer delayed his arrival is, the livelier is his gratitude, the greater are the marks of his satisfaction. Among the ancient Jews, the night had only three divisions (Judg. 7 : 19) ;

* Ver. 38. Instead of και εαν ελθη εν τη δευτερα φυλακη, και εν τη τριτη φυλακη ελθη, και ευρη ουτως, ℵ. B. L. T^{w}. X. some Mnn. Syr^{sch} It$^{aliq.}$ read και εαν εν τη δευτερα και εν τη τριτη φυλακη ελθη και ευρη ουτως. D. It$^{aliq.}$ Marcion, και εαν ελθη τη εσπερινη φυλακη και ευρησει ουτως ποιησαι (*sic facientes*) και εαν τη δευτερα και τη τριτη. ℵ$^{a.}$. B. D. L. Syr$^{cur.}$ omit οι δουλοι before εκεινοι ; ℵ* It$^{aliq.}$ Ir. omit οι δουλοι εκεινοι.

later, probably after the Roman subjugation, four were admitted : from 6 to 9, from 9 to midnight, from midnight to 3, and from 3 to 6 o'clock. If, as cannot be doubted, the master's return represents the Parousia, this parable teaches that that event may be long delayed—much longer than any one even of the disciples imagined—and that this delay will be the means of testing their fidelity. The same thought reappears in the parable of the ten virgins (Matt. 25 : 5), "While the bridegroom tarried ;" and again in that of the talents (25 : 19), "After a long time, the lord of those servants cometh." Jesus thus proclaimed His return, but not the immediateness of that return. One hardly dares to apply the promise included in this parable : The Lord in His glory serving him who has faithfully waited for and served Him here below ! There is an apparent contradiction of Luke 17 : 7–9. But in the latter passage Jesus is expressing the feeling which should animate the servant : "I am, after all that I have done, *but an unprofitable servant.*" Jesus wishes, in opposition to pharisaism, to sweep away the legal idea of merit. Here He is describing the feeling of the Master himself ; we are in the sphere of love both on the side of the servant and of the master. The variations of ver. 38 do not affect its general meaning.

The Parousia is a sweet and glorious event to the servants of Jesus (vers. 35–38). But at the same time it is solemn and awful : for He who returns is not only a well-beloved Master, who comes to requite everything which has been given for Him ; He is also a thief who takes away everything which should not have been kept.

Vers. 39 and 40.* *Parable of the Thief.*—"And this ye know, that if the goodman of the house had known what hour the thief would come, he would have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken through. 40. Be ye therefore ready also ; for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not." Γινώσκετε, *ye know*, should be taken as indic. rather than as imper. ; this knowledge is the basis of the exhortation, ver. 40. The application should be made as follows : If the hour of attack were known, men would not fail to hold themselves ready *against that hour ;* and therefore when it is not known, as in this case, the only way is to be *always* ready. The real place of this saying is possibly that given to it by Matthew (24 : 42–44) in the eschatological discourses ; Mark is here at one with him. Of all the sayings of Jesus, there is not one whose influence has made itself more felt in the writings of the N. T. than this (1 Thess. 5 : 1, 2 ; 2 Pet. 3 : 10 ; Rev. 3 : 3, 16 · 15) ; it had awakened a deep echo in the heart of the disciples. It indicates the real meaning of waiting for the second advent of Christ. The Church has not the task of fixing beforehand that unknown and unknowable time ; she has nothing else to do, in virtue of her very ignorance, from which she ought not to wish to escape, than to remain invariably on the watch. This attitude is her security, her life, the principle of her virgin purity. This duty of watching evidently embraces both the disengagement and the attachment which are commanded in this discourse.

4th. To the Apostles : vers. 41–53.—Up till now, Jesus had been speaking to all believers ; from this point, on occasion of a question put by Peter, He addresses the apostles in particular, and reminds them of the special responsibility which attaches to them in the prospect of their Master's return (vers 41–48) ; then He gives vent to the emotions which fill His heart in view of the moral revolution which He is about to work on the earth (vers. 49–53).

* Ver. 39. ℵ. D. Syr^{cur}. It^{aliq}. omit *εγρηγορησεν αν και*. Ver. 40. ℵ. B. L. Q. some Mnn. It. omit *ουν* after *υμεις*.

Vers. 41–48.* *The Parable of the Two Stewards.*—The magnificence of the promise, ver. 37, has struck Peter ; he asks himself if such a recompense is intended for all the subjects of the Messiah, or ought not rather to be restricted to those who shall play the chief part in His kingdom. If that is the meaning of his question, ver. 41, it relates not to the parable of the thief (vers. 39, 40), but to that of the Master's return (vers. 35–38), which would confirm the impression that vers. 39 and 40 are an interpolation in this discourse, to be ascribed either to Luke or to the document from which he borrows. The question of Peter recalls one put by the same apostle, Matt. 19 : 27, which, so far as the sense goes, is exactly similar. Jesus continues His teaching as if He took no account (ἄρα, *then*) of Peter's question ; but in reality He gives such a turn to the warning which follows about watchfulness, that it includes the precise answer to the question. For a similar form, comp. 19 : 25, 26, John 14 : 21–23, *et al.* All shall be recompensed for their fidelity, but those more magnificently than the rest who have been set to watch over their brethren in the Master's absence (vers. 42-44) ; as, on the contrary, he who has been in this higher position and neglected his duty, shall be punished much more severely than the servants of a less exalted class (vers. 45–46). Finally, vers. 47, 48, the general principle on which this judgment of the Church proceeds.

Jesus gives an interrogative form to the indirect answer which He makes to Peter's question : " Who then is the steward . . . ?" Why this style of expression ? De Wette thinks that Jesus speaks as if He were seeking with emotion among His own for this devoted servant. Bleek finds again here the form observed, 11 : 5–8 : " Who is the steward who, if his master comes to find him, shall not be established by him . . . ?" Neither of the explanations is very natural. Jesus puts a real question ; He invites Peter to seek that steward (it ought to be himself and every apostle). Matthew, by preserving (24 : 45–51) the interrogative form, while omitting Peter's question, which gave rise to it, supplies a remarkable testimony to the fidelity of Luke's narrative. The *stewards*, although slaves (ver. 45), were servants of a higher rank. The θεραπεία is the general body of domestics, the *familitium* of the Latins. This term corresponds to the *all* in Peter's question, as the person of the ruler to the *us* in the same question. The fut. καταστήσει, *shall make*, seems to indicate that the Church shall not be so constituted till after the departure of the Master. Καιρός, the *due season*, denotes the time fixed for the weekly or daily distribution ; σιτομέτριον, their rations. There is a difference between the recompense promised, ver. 44, to the faithful steward and that which was pledged, ver. 37, to the watchful servant. The latter was of a more inward character ; it was the expression of the Master's personal attachment to the faithful servant who had personally bestowed his care upon him. The former is more glorious ; it is a sort of official recompense for services rendered to the house : the matter in question is a high government in the kingdom of glory, in recompense for labors to which the faithful servant has devoted himself in an influential position during the economy of grace. This relation is indicated by the correspondence of the two καταστήσει, vers. 42 and 44. This saying seems to assume that the apostolate will be perpetuated till the return of Christ ; and the figure employed

* Ver. 42. 13 Mjj. several Mnn. read ὁ instead of καὶ before φρόνιμος. ℵ* Tʷ. Itᵖˡᵉʳⁱᵍᵘᵉ, Vg. read, instead of κατεστησεν, κατεστησεν (taken from Matthew). D. L. Q. X. omit τον before διδοναι. Ver. 47. L. Syr. Itᵖˡᵉʳⁱᵍᵘᵉ, omit μηδε ποιησας. ℵ. B. T., η instead of μηδε.

does indisputably prove that there will subsist in the Church to the very end a ministry of the word established by Christ. Of this the apostles were so well aware, that when they were themselves leaving the earth, they took care to establish ministers of the word to fill their places in the Church. This ministry was a continuation, if not of their whole office, at least of one of its most indispensable functions, that of which Jesus speaks in our parable—the regular distribution of spiritual nourishment to the flock; comp. the Pastoral Epistles and 1 Pet. 5. The theory which makes the pastorate emanate from the Church as its representative is therefore not biblical; the office is rather an emanation from the apostolate, and thus mediately an institution of Jesus Himself. Comp. Eph. 4 : 11 : "He gave some as . . . pastors and teachers." It is Jesus who will have this ministry, who has established it by His mandatories, who procures for His Church in every age those who have a mission to fill it, and who endows them for that end. Hence their weightier responsibility.

Vers. 45, 46 represent an apostle or an unfaithful minister under the image of an unprincipled steward. The condition of fidelity being the constant watching for the Master's return, this servant, to set himself more at his ease in his unfaithfulness, puts the thought of that moment far off. So the minister of Jesus does, who, in place of watching for the Parousia, substitutes the idea of indefinite progress.* What will become of his practical fidelity, since it is the constant watching for the Lord which should be its support? *Beating, eating,* and *drinking* are figures, like the regular and conscientious distribution (ver. 42). The ecclesiastical functionaries described in this piece are those who, instead of dividing the word of Christ to the Church, impose on it their own, who tyrannize over souls instead of tending them, and show themselves so much the more jealous of their rights the more negligently they discharge their duties. Διχοτομεῖν, strictly, *to cleave in two,* denotes a punishment which was really used among the nations of antiquity (Egyptians, Chaldeans, Greeks, Romans; comp. also 2 Sam. 12 : 31; 1 Chron. 20 : 3; Heb. 11 : 37). But this literal meaning does not suit here, since we still hear of a position which this servant is to receive; at least if we do not admit with Bleek that in these last words Jesus passes from the figure to the application. Is it not more natural, even though we cannot cite examples of the usage, to understand the word in the sense of the Latin expression, *flagellis discindere,* to scourge the back with a rod (the : *shall be beaten with many stripes,* ver. 47)?

The portion in question after this terrible punishment is imprisonment, or even the extreme penalty of the law—the cross, for example, which was always preceded by scourging. The word ἀπίστων, "with *the unbelievers,*" might support the explanation given by Bleek; but though the application pierces the veil of the parable, the strict sense is not altogether set aside: "those who cannot be trusted," strangers to the house. Matthew says: *the hypocrites,* false friends (the Pharisees). A faithless apostle will be no better treated than an adversary. *To have one's portion with* is a Hebraistic and Greek expression, which signifies *to share the lot of* . . .

Vers. 47 and 48. *The Principle.*—"And that servant which knew his lord's will, and prepared nothing, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes. 48. But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required; and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more."

* See on vv. 18, 19, closing paragraph.—J. H.

Along with the superiority of position described above, the apostles had received a superior degree of *knowledge;* it is to this new advantage that ver. 47*a* refers. It is connected with the preceding; for the higher the servant is placed by his master, the fuller are the instructions he receives from him. The same manner of judging will be extended to this other kind of superiority. Ostervald, understanding ἑαυτόν with μὴ ἑτοιμάσας, translates, "who prepared not *himself.*" This ellipsis is inadmissible. The meaning is, *who prepared not* [what was necessary to receive his master according to his wishes]. It is the antithesis of vers. 35–37. The servant whom the master has not initiated so specially into his intentions is nevertheless responsible to a certain extent. For he also has a certain knowledge of his will; comp. the application of this same principle, Rom. 2 : 12. Ver. 48*b*. The general maxim on which the whole of the preceding rests. The two parallel propositions are not wholly synonymous. The passive ἐδόθη, *was given*, simply denotes an assigned position; the *middle* form, παρέθεντο, *men have committed*, indicates that the trust was taken by the master as his own interest; the figure is that of a sum deposited. Consequently the first term is properly applied to the apostolic *commission*, and to the authority with which it is accompanied; the second, to the higher light granted to the apostles. What is claimed of each is not fruits which do not depend on the laborer, but devotedness to work. Meyer thinks that *the more* signifies "*more* than had been committed to him." It is more natural to understand: *more* than will be exacted from others who have received less. On the subject of the verbs παρέθεντο and αἰτήσουσιν, see ver. 20.

Mark has preserved (13 : 37), at the close of the parable of the porter, which he alone has, but which refers to the same duty of watchfulness as the two preceding parables in Luke, this final exhortation: "What I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch." This word corresponds in a striking manner to the meaning of Jesus' answer to Peter in Luke: "All should watch, for all shall share in the Master's personal requital (ver. 37); but very specially (περισσότερον, ver. 48) ye, my apostles, who have to expect either a greater recompense or a severer punishment." On this supposition, Luke relates the question of Peter and the indirect answer of Jesus; Mark, a word of Jesus which belonged to His direct answer. How is the relation between the two to be explained? Holtzmann thinks that Luke of himself imagined the question of Peter, founding on this last word of Jesus in Mark. He cannot help confessing, further, that this interpolation has been very skilfully managed by Luke. Such procedure, in reality, would be as ingenious as arbitrary; it is inadmissible. The account of Luke, besides, finds a confirmation in the text of Matthew, in which the interrogative form of the answer of Jesus is preserved exactly as we find it in Luke, and that though Matthew has omitted Peter's question, which alone explains this form. Weizsäcker supposes inversely that the question of Peter in Luke was borrowed by the latter from the interrogative form of the saying of Jesus in Matt. 24 : 45: "Who is then the faithful servant . . . ?" But Mark's account stands to defend that of Luke against this new accusation. For, as we have seen, the last words of the discourse in Mark had no meaning except in reference to Peter's question reported by Luke. Luke's form cannot be derived from Mark without protest from Matthew, nor from Matthew without Mark in his turn protesting. We have evidently, as it were, the pieces of a wheelwork taken down; each evangelist has faithfully preserved to us those of them which an incomplete tradition had transmitted to him. Applied to a written document, this dividing would form a real mutilation; as the result of a circulating tradition, it admits of easy explanation.

After having thus followed the natural course of the conversation, Jesus returns to the thought from which it had started, the vanity of earthly goods. He shows how this truth directly applies to the present situation (vers 49–53).

Vers. 49 and 50.* *The Character of the Immediate Future.*—"I am come to send fire on the earth; and what will I if it be already kindled? 50. But I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!" Is it a time," said Elisha to the unfaithful Gehazi, "to receive lands and cattle when the hand of God is upon Israel," that is to say, when Shalmaneser is at the gates of Samaria? Is it a time for the believer to give himself up to the peaceable enjoyment of earthly goods when the great struggle is beginning? The Church is about to be born; Israel is about to perish, and the Holy Land to be given over to the Gentiles. Such is the connection, too moving to be expressed by a logical particle, which is implied by the remarkable asyndeton between vers. 48 and 49. Πῦρ βάλλειν, strictly, *to throw a firebrand*. Jesus feels that His presence is for the earth the brand which is to set everything on fire. "Every fruitful thing," says M. Rénan, "is rich in wars." Jesus understood the fruitfulness of His work. The expression *I am come*, which Jesus frequently uses in the Syn., finds its only natural explanation in His lips in the consciousness which He had of His pre-existence. The fire in question here is not the fire of the Holy Spirit, as some of the Fathers thought. The sequel proves that it is the spiritual excitement produced in opposite directions by the coming of Jesus, whence will result the διαμερισμός, *the division*, described from ver. 51 onward. Two humanities will henceforth be in conflict within the bosom of every nation, under every roof: this thought profoundly moves the heart of the Prince of peace. Hence the broken style of the following words. The εἰ may be taken in the sense of *that*, which it often has, and τί in the sense of *how*: "How I wish that this fire were already burning!" (Olshausen, De Wette, Bleek). But this meaning of the two words εἰ and τί, and especially of the second, is not very natural. Accordingly Grotius, Meyer, etc., have been led to admit two propositions—the one forming a question, the other the answer: "And what will I? Oh, that it only were already kindled!" The sense is radically the same. But the second proposition would come too abruptly as an answer to the preceding. Ewald recurs to the idea of a single sentence, only he seeks to give to θέλω a meaning which better justifies the use of εἰ: "And of what have I to complain if it be already kindled?" This sense does not differ much from that which appears to us the most natural: "What have I more to seek, since it is already kindled?" This saying expresses a mournful satisfaction with the fact that this inevitable rending of humanity is already beginning, as proved by the event recorded vers. 1–12. Jesus submits to bring in war where He wished to establish peace. But it must be; it is His mission: "I am come to . . ."

Meantime this fire, which is already kindled, is far yet from bursting into a flame; in order to that there is a condition to be fulfilled, the thought of which weighs heavily on the heart of Jesus: there needs the fact which, by manifesting the deadly antagonism between the world and God, shall produce the division of which Jesus speaks between man and man; there needs the cross. Without the cross, the conflagration lighted on the earth by the presence of Jesus would very soon be extinguished, and the world would speedily fall back to its undisturbed level; hence ver. 50. The δέ is adversative: "But though the fire is already kindled, it needs, in order that it may blaze forth, that . . ." The baptism in question here is the same as that of which Jesus speaks, Matt. 20:22 (at least if the expressions analo-

* Ver. 49. Instead of εἰς, which the T. R. reads with 11 Mjj. (Byz.) and the Mnn., 10 Mjj. (Alex.) 40 Mnn. read επι. Ver. 50. The MSS. are divided between ον (T. R.) and οτου (Alex.)

gous to these are authentic in that passage). Jesus certainly makes an allusion to His baptism at the hands of His forerunner, which included a consecration to death. The figure is as follows. Jesus sees Himself about to be plunged into a bath of flame, from which He shall come forth the torch which shall set the whole world on fire. The Lord expresses with perfect candor the impression of terror which is produced in Him by the necessity of going through this furnace of suffering, Συνέχεσθαι, *to be closely pressed* (straitened), sometimes by the power of love (2 Cor. 5 : 14); elsewhere, by that of conflicting desires (Phil. 1 : 23); here, doubtless, by mournful impatience to have done with a painful task. He is under pressure to enter into this suffering, because He is in haste to get out of it. "A prelude of Gethsemane," says Gess in an admirable passage on this discourse.* Here, indeed, we have the first crisis of that agony of which we catch a second indication, John 12 : 27: "Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say?" and which is breathed forth in all its intensity in Gethsemane. Luke alone has preserved to us the memorial of this first revelation of the inmost feelings of Jesus.

After this saying, which is a sort of parenthesis drawn forth by the impression, produced on Him by the thought in the preceding verse, He resumes at ver. 51 the development of His declaration, ver. 49.

Vers. 51–53.† *The Picture of the Future Just Declared.*—"Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, nay; but division. 52. For from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three. 53. The father shall be divided against the son, and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother, the mother-in-law against her daughter-in-law, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law." Δοκεῖτε, *suppose ye*, is no doubt aimed at the illusion with which the disciples flattered themselves, yet hoping for the establishment of the Messianic kingdom without struggles or sufferings (19 : 11). Jesus does not deny that peace should be the final result of His work; but certainly He denies that it will be its immediate effect. The simplest solution of the phrase ἀλλ' ἤ is to take it as an abbreviation of οὐχὶ ἀλλο ἤ: "Nothing else than . . ." Vers. 52 and 53 describe the fire lighted by Jesus. By the preaching of the disciples, the conflagration spreads; with their arrival, it invades every family one after another. But "the fifth commandment itself must give way to a look directed to Him . . . Undoubtedly it is God who has formed the natural bonds between men; but Jesus introduces a new principle, holier than the bond of nature, to unite men to one another" (Gess, p. 22). Even Holtzmann observes that the five persons indicated, ver. 52, are expressly enumerated, ver. 53: father, son, mother, daughter, daughter-in-law. Matthew (10 : 35) has not preserved this delicate touch; are we to think that Luke invented this nice precision, or that Matthew, finding it in the common document, has obliterated it? Two suppositions equally improbable. Ἐπί indicates hostility, and with more energy in the last two members, where this prep. is construed with the acc.; probably because between mother in-law and daughter-in-law religious hostility is strengthened by previous natural animosity.

* Work quoted, p. 79. "We cast ourselves in contemplation into the oppressed soul of Jesus . . . into His Passion before the Passion" (ib.).

† Ver. 53. ℵ. B. D. L. T^{w}. U. some Mnn. Vg., *διαμερισθησονται* instead of *διαμερισθησεται*. Alex. some Mnn., *θυγατερα, μητερα*, instead of *θυγατρι, μητρι*. ℵ. B. D. L. omit *αυτης*.

5th. To the Multitudes: vers. 54–59.—After having announced and described the rending, the first symptoms of which He already discerns, Jesus returns anew to the multitude whom He sees plunged in security and impenitence; He points out to those men, so thoroughly earthly and self-satisfied, the thunderbolt which is about to break over their heads, and beseeches them to anticipate the explosion of the divine wrath.

Vers. 54–56.* *The Signs of the Times.*—"And He said also to the people, When ye see a cloud rise out of the west, straightway ye say, There cometh a shower; and so it is. 55. And when ye see the south wind blow, ye say, There will be heat; and it cometh to pass. 56. Ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky and of the earth; but how is it that ye do not discern this time?" Ἔλεγε δὲ καί, *He said also*, is, as we have already seen (i. p. 177), the formula which Luke uses when Jesus at the close of a doctrinal discourse adds a last word of more gravity, which raises the question to its full height, and is intended to leave on the mind of the hearer an impression never to be effaced: "Finally, I have a last word to address to you." This concluding idea is that of the urgency of conversion. Country people, in the matter of weather, plume themselves on being good prophets, and in fact their prognostics do not mislead them: "Ye say, ye say . . . and as ye say, it comes to pass." The rains in Palestine come from the Mediterranean (1 Kings 18 : 44); the south wind, on the contrary, the simoom blowing from the desert, brings drought. These people know it; so their calculation is quickly made (εὐθέως); and, what is more, it is correct (καὶ γίνεται, twice repeated). So it is, because all this passes in the order of things in which they are interested: they give themselves to discover the future in the present; and as they will, they can. And this clear-sightedness with which man is endowed, they put not forth in the service of a higher interest! A John the Baptist, a Jesus appear, live and die, without their concluding that a solemn hour for them has struck! This contradiction in their mode of acting is what Jesus designates by the word *hypocrites*. What they want is not the eye, it is the will to use it. The word καιρός, *the propitious time*, is explained by the expression, 19 : 44, *the time of thy visitation*. Δοκιμάζειν, *to appreciate the importance*. Matt. 16 : 1–3 ought not to be regarded as parallel to our passage. The idea is wholly different. Only in Matthew our ver. 56 has been joined with a parable similar to that of Luke in point of form, and that by an association of ideas easily understood.

Vers. 57–59.† *The Urgency of Reconciliation to God.*—"Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right? 58. (For) While thou goest with thine adversary to the magistrate, as thou art in the way give diligence that thou mayest be delivered from him; lest he hale thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and the officer cast thee into prison. 59. I tell thee, thou shalt not depart thence till thou hast paid the very last mite." A new example (τί δὲ καί) of what they would make haste to do, if their good-will equalled their intelligence. Ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν, *of yourselves;* same meaning as the "at once ye say" (ver 54). It should be so natural to perform this duty that it ought not to be necessary to remind them of

* Ver. 54. 6 Mjj. (Alex.) some Mnn. omit την. ℵ. B. L., επι instead of απο. Ver. 56. 6 Mjj. 40 Mnn. Syr. It. Vg. put του ουρανου before της γης. ℵ. B. L. T^{w}., ουκ οιδατε δοκιμαζειν instead of ου δοκιμαζετε.

† Ver. 58. Some Mjj., παραδωσει instead of παραδω (T. R. with 14 Mjj.); βαλει or βαλῃ instead of βαλλῃ (T. R. with some Mnn.). Ver. 59. ℵ. B. L., εως instead of εως ου. 5 Mjj., το εσχατον instead of τον εσχατον (14 Mjj.).

it. But, alas! in the domain of which Jesus is speaking they are not so quick to draw conclusions as in that wherein they habitually move. Their finger needs to be put on things. Τὸ δικαίον, *what is just*, denotes the right step to be taken in the given situation—to wit, as the sequel shows, reconciliation to God by conversion. The following parable (ver. 58) is presented in the form of an exhortation, because the application is blended with the figure. The *for* (ver. 58) has this force : "Why dost not thou act thus with God? For it is what thou wouldst not fail to do with a human adversary." We must avoid translating the ὡς ὑπάγεις, "when thou goest" (E. V.). Ὡς signifies "while thou goest;" it is explained by the *in the way* which follows. It is before arriving at the tribunal, while you are on the way thither, that you must get reconciled to him who accuses you. Once before the judge, justice takes its course. The important thing, therefore, is to anticipate that fatal term. Ἐργασίαν δοῦναι seems to be a Latinism, *operam dare*. In the application, God is at once adversary, judge, and officer : the first by His holiness, the second by His justice, the third by His power. Or should we understand by the creditor, God ; by the judge, Jesus ; by the officers, the angels (Matt. 13 : 41)? Will it ever be possible, relatively to God, to pay the last mite? Jesus does not enter into the question, which lies beyond the horizon of the parable. Other passages seem to prove that in His view this term can never be reached (Mark 9 : 42–49). There is in the whole passage, and especially in the *I tell thee* (ver. 59), the expression of a personal consciousness wholly free from all need of reconciliation.

Matthew places this saying in the Sermon on the Mount (v. 25, 26) ; he applies it to the duty of reconciliation *between men* as the condition of man's reconciliation to God. It cannot be doubted that this saying, placed there by Matthew in virtue of a simple association of ideas, finds its real context in Luke, in the discourse which is so perfectly linked together.

10. *Conversation on two Events of the Day :* 13 : 1–9. Luke does not say that the following event took place immediately after the preceding, but only in a general way, ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ (ver. 1), in the same circumstances. The three following sayings (vers. 1–3, 4, 5, 6–9) breathe the same engagedness of mind as filled the preceding discourses. The external situation also is the same. Jesus is moving slowly on, taking advantage of every occasion which presents itself to direct the hearts of men to things above. The *necessity* of conversion is that of which Jesus here reminds His hearers ; in 12 : 54 *et seq.* He had rather preached its *urgency*.

1*st*. Vers. 1–3.* *The Galileans massacred by Pilate.* Josephus does not mention the event to which the following words relate. The Galileans were somewhat restless ; conflicts with the Roman garrison easily arose. In the expression, *mingling their blood with that of the sacrifice*, there is a certain poetical emphasis which often characterizes popular accounts. The impf. παρῆσαν signifies "they were there relating." Jesus with His piercing eye immediately discerns the prophetical significance of the fact. The carnage due to Pilate's sword is only the prelude to that which will soon be carried out by the Roman army throughout all the Holy Land, and especially in the temple, the last asylum of the nation. Was not all that remained of the Galilean people actually assembled forty years later in the temple, expiating their national impenitence under the stroke of Titus? The word *likewise* (ver. 3) may therefore be

* Ver. 2. ℵ. B. D. L., ταυτα instead of τοιουτα. Ver. 3. The mss. are divided between ωσαυτως (T. R., Byz.) and ομοιως (Alex.) A. D. M. X. Γ. and several Mnn., μετανοησητε instead of μετανοητε.

taken literally. A serious, individual, and national conversion at the call of Jesus could alone have prevented that catastrophe.

2d. Vers. 4, 5.* *The Persons buried by the Tower of Siloam.* The disaster which has been related recalls another to His mind, which He mentions spontaneously, and which He applies specially to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. The aqueduct and pool of Siloam are situated where the valley of Tyropœon, between Sion and Moriah, opens into that of Jehoshaphat. Forty years later, the fall of the houses of the burning capital justified this warning not less strikingly. When a disaster comes upon an individual, there is a disposition among men to seek the cause of it in some special guiltiness attaching to the victim. Jesus turns His hearers back to human guilt in general, and their own in particular; and from that, which to the pharisaic heart is an occasion of proud confidence, He derives a motive to humiliation and conversion, an example of what was called, 12 : 57, *judging what is right.*

3d. Vers. 6–9.† *The Time of Grace.* Here again we have the formula ἔλεγε δέ, which announces the true and final word on the situation. (See at 12 : 54.) A vineyard forms an excellent soil for fruit-trees. As usually, the fig-tree represents Israel. God is the owner, Jesus the vine-dresser who intercedes. Ἵνατί (γένηται), *To what end?* Καί, *moreover;* not only is it useless itself, but it also renders the ground useless. Bengel, Wieseler, Weizsäcker find an allusion in the *three years* to the period of the ministry of Jesus which was already passed, and so draw from this parable chronological conclusions. Altogether without reason; for such details ought to be explained by their relation to the general figure of the parable of which they form a part, and not by circumstances wholly foreign to the description. In the figure chosen by Jesus, three years are the time of a *full* trial, at the end of which the inference of incurable sterility may be drawn. Those three years, therefore, represent the time of grace granted to Israel; and the last year, added at the request of the gardener, the forty years' respite between the Friday of the crucifixion and the destruction of Jerusalem, which were owing to that prayer of Jesus: "Father, forgive them." The MSS. have the two forms κόπρια, from κόπριον, and κοπρίαν, from κοπρία. The proposition κἂν μέν . . . is elliptical, as often in classical Greek; we must understand καλῶς ἔχει. The Alex., by placing εἰς τὸ μέλλον before εἰ δὲ μήγε, probably wished to escape this ellipsis: "If it bear fruit, let it be for the future [live]." The extraordinary pains of the gardener bestowed on this sickly tree represent the marvels of love which Jesus shall display in His death and resurrection, then at Pentecost and by means of the apostolic preaching, in order to rescue the people from their impenitence. This parable gives Israel to know that its life is only a respite, and that this respite is nearing its end. Perhaps Paul makes an allusion to this saying when he admonishes Gentile Christians, the branches of the wild olive, saying to them, ἐπεὶ καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃ (Rom. 11 : 22).

Holtzmann acknowledges the historical truth of the introduction, ver. 1. He ascribes it to the *Logia*, like everything which he finds true in the introductions of Luke. But if this piece was in A., of which Matthew made use, how has he omitted it altogether?

* Ver. 4. The MSS. are divided between ουτοι (T. R.) and αυτοι (Alex). Εν before Ιερουσαλημ is omitted by B. D. L. Z. Ver. 5. The MSS. are divided between ομοιως and ωσαυτως; between μετανοητε and μετανοσητε.

† Ver. 7. ℵ. B. D. L. Tw. some Mnn. Syrcur. It. Vg. add αφ' ου after τρια ετη. Ver 9. ℵ. B. L. Tw. 2 Mnn. place εις το μελλον before ει δε μηγε.

11. *The Progress of the Kingdom :* 13 : 10–21. During this journey, as throughout His whole ministry, Jesus did not fail to frequent the synagogues on the Sabbath days. The present narrative introduces us to one of those scenes. Perhaps the feeling which led Luke to place it here, was that of the contrast between Israel, which was hasting to destruction, and the Church, which was already growing. A glorious deed, which tells strongly on the multitude (vers. 10–17), leads Jesus to describe in two parables the power of the kingdom of God (vers. 18–21).

1*st.* Vers. 10–17.* *The Healing of the palsied Woman.* And first the miracle, vers 10–13. This woman was completely bent, and her condition was connected with a psychical weakness, which in turn arose from a higher cause, by which the will of the sufferer was bound. This state of things is described by the phrase : *a spirit of infirmity.* Jesus first of all heals the psychical malady : *Thou art loosed.* Λέλυσθαι, the perfect : it is an accomplished fact. The will of the sufferer through faith draws from this declaration the strength which it lacked. At the same time, by the laying on of His hands, Jesus restores the bodily organism to the control of the emancipated will ; and the cure is complete.

The conversation, vers. 14–17. It was the Sabbath. The ruler of the synagogue imagines that he should apply to Jesus the Rabbinical regulation for practising physicians. Only, not daring to attack Him, he addresses his discourse to the people (ver. 14). Θεραπεύεσθε, come to get yourselves healed. Jesus takes up the challenge. The plural *hypocrites* is certainly the true reading (comp. the plural *adversaries*, ver. 17). Jesus puts on trial the whole party of whom this man is the representative. The severity of His apostrophe is justified by the comparison which follows (vers. 15 and 16) between the freedom which they take with the Sabbath law, when their own interests, even the most trivial, are involved, and the extreme rigor with which they apply it, when the question relates to their neighbor's interests, even the gravest, as well as to their estimate of the conduct of Jesus. The three contrasts between *ox* (or *ass*) and *daughter of Abraham*, between *stall* and *Satan*, and between the two bonds, material and spiritual, to be unloosed, are obvious at a glance. The last touch : *eighteen years*, in which the profoundest pity is expressed, admirably closes the answer.

Holtzmann thinks that what has led Luke to place this account here, is the connection between the eighteen years' infirmity (ver. 11) and the three years' sterility (ver. 7) ! Not content with ascribing to Luke this first puerility, he imputes to him a second still greater : that which has led Luke to place at ver. 18 the parable of the grain of mustard seed, is that it is borrowed from the vegetable kingdom, like that of the fig-tree (vers. 7–9) ! !

This so nervous reply brings the admiration of the people to a height, and shuts the mouth of His adversaries. Jesus then, rising to the general idea, of which this deed is only a particular application, to wit, the *power* of the kingdom of God develops it in two parables fitted to present this truth in its two chief aspects ; the two are, the *mustard seed* (vers. 18, 19) and the *leaven* (vers. 20, 21).

2*d.* Vers. 18–21. *The Two Parables.*—The kingdom of God has two kinds of power : the power of *extension*, by which it gradually embraces all nations ; the

* Ver. 11. ℵ. B. L. T^{w}. X. some Mnn. It^{plerique}, Vg. omit ην after γυνη. Ver. 14. The MSS. are divided between εν ταυταις (T. R.) and εν αυταις (Alex.). Ver. 15. Some Mjj. and Mnn. Syr., ο Ιησους instead of ο κυριος. 17 Mjj. 80 Mnn. It. Vg., υποκριται instead of υποκριτα, which the T. R. reads with D. V. X. the most of the Mnn. Syr.

power of *transformation*, by which it gradually regenerates the whole of human life. The natural symbol of the first is a seed which acquires in a short time an increase out of all proportion to its original smallness; that of the second, a fermenting element, materially very inconsiderable, but capable of exercising its assimilating virtue over a large mass. Those two parables form part of the collection, Matt. 13 : 31, *et seq.*; the first only is found Mark 4 : 30, 31.

Vers. 18 and 19.* Again the formula ἔλεγε δέ (or οὖν, as some Alex. read). The two questions of ver. 18 express the activity of mind which seeks in nature the analogies which it needs. The first: "To what *is* like . . .," affirms the existence of the emblem sought; the second: "To what shall I liken . . .," has the discovery of it in view. Mark likewise introduces this parable with two questions; but they differ both in substance and form from those of Luke. Tradition had indeed preserved the memory of this style of speaking; only it had modified the tenor of the questions. We must certainly reject with the Alex., in the text both of Luke and Matthew the epithet *great*, applied to *tree*. Jesus does not mean to contrast a great tree with a small one, but a tree to vegetables in general. The mustard-plant in the East does not rise beyond the height of one of our small fruit-trees. But the exceptional thing is, that a plant like mustard, which belongs to the class of garden herbs, and the grain of which is exceedingly small, puts forth a woody stalk adorned with branches, and becomes a *veritable tree*. It is thus the striking type of the disproportion which prevails between the smallness of the kingdom of God at its commencement, when it is yet enclosed in the person of Jesus, and its final expansion, when it shall embrace all peoples. The form of the parable is shorter and simpler in Luke than in the other two.

Vers. 20 and 21.† Jesus anew seeks an image (ver. 20) to portray the power of the kingdom of God as a principle of moral transformation. There is here, as in all the pairs of parables, a second aspect of the same truth; comp. 5 : 36–38; 15 : 3–10; Matt. 13 : 44–46; John 10 : 1–10. We even find in Luke 15 and John 10 a third parable completing the other two. Leaven is the emblem of every moral principle, good or bad, possessing in some degree a power of fermentation and assimilation; comp. Gal. 5 : 9. The *three measures* should be explained, like the *three years* (ver. 7), by the figure taken as a whole. It was the quantity ordinarily employed for a batch. They have been understood as denoting the three branches of the human race, Shemites, Japhethites, and Hamites; or, indeed, Greeks, Jews, and Samaritans (Theod. of Mopsuestia); or, again, of the heart, soul, and spirit (Augustine). Such reveries are now unthought of. The idea is, that the spiritual life enclosed in the Gospel must penetrate the *whole* of human life, the individual, thereby the family, and through the latter, society.

Those two parables form the most entire contrast to the picture which the Jewish imagination had formed of the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom. One wave of the magic wand was to accomplish everything in the twinkling of an eye. In opposition to this superficial notion, Jesus sets the idea of a moral development which works by spiritual means and takes account of human freedom, consequently slow and progressive. How can it be maintained, in view of such sayings, that He

* Ver. 18. ℵ. B. L. some Mnn. It^{plerique}, Vg., ουν instead of δε after ελεγεν. Ver. 19. ℵ. B. D. L. T^{w}. Syr^{cur}. It^{aliq}. omit μεγα after δενδρον.

† Ver. 20. The Alex. It. Vg. add και before παλιν. Ver. 21. The MSS. are divided between ενεκρυψεν (T. R.) and εκρυψεν (Alex.).

believed in the immediate nearness of His return? The place which those two parables occupy in the great collection Matt. 13 is evidently the result of a systematic arrangement; there they have the effect of two flowers in a herbarium. Luke has restored them to their natural situation. His account is at once independent of and superior to that of Matthew; Mark accords with Matthew.

SECOND CYCLE.—13 : 22; 17 : 10.

A New Series of Incidents in the Journey.

Ver. 22 serves as an introduction to this whole cycle. Jesus slowly continues His journey of evangelization (διεπορεύετο, *He proceeded through* the country), stopping at every city, and even at every village (κατά, distributive), taking advantage of every occasion which presents itself to instruct both those who accompany Him and the people of the place, only pursuing in the main a general direction toward Jerusalem (διδάσκων, ποιούμενος). Nothing could be more natural than this remark, which is founded on the general introduction, 9 : 51, and in keeping with the analogous forms used in cases of summing up and transition, which we have observed throughout this Gospel.

1. *The Rejection of Israel, and the Admission of the Gentiles:* 13 : 23-30. An unforeseen question calls forth a new flash. It was probably evoked by a saying of Jesus, which appeared opposed to the privileges of Israel, that is to say, to its *national* participation in the Messianic blessedness.

Vers. 23–27.* "Then one said unto Him, Lord are there few that be saved? And He said unto them. 24. Strive to enter in at the strait gate: for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able. 25. When once the Master of the house is risen up, and shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying Lord, Lord, open unto us, and He shall answer and say unto you, I know you not whence ye are: 26. Then shall ye begin to say, We have eaten and drunk in Thy presence, and Thou hast taught in our streets. 27. But He shall say, I tell you, I know you not whence ye are; depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity." The question of ver. 23 was to a certain extent a matter of curiosity. In such cases Jesus immediately gives a practical turn to His answer. Comp. 12 : 41, John 3 : 3; and hence Luke says (ver. 23). "He said *to them.*" Jesus gives no direct answer to the man; He addresses a warning to the people on the occasion of His question. The Messianic kingdom is represented under the figure of a palace, into which men do not enter, as might appear natural, by a magnificent portal, but by a narrow gate, low, and scarcely visible, a mere postern. Those invited refuse to pass in thereby; then it is closed, and they in vain supplicate the master of the house to re-open it; it remains closed, and they are, and continue, excluded. The application is blended, to a certain extent, as in 12 : 58, 59, with the figure. Ἀγωνίζεσθαι, *to strive*, refers in the parable to the difficulty of passing through the narrow opening; in the application, to the humiliations of penitence, the struggles of conversion. The *strait gate* represents attachment to the lowly Messiah; the magnificent gateway by which the Jews would have wished to enter, would represent, if it were mentioned, the appearance of the glorious Messiah whom they expected. *I declare unto you,*

* Ver 24. ℵ. B. D. L. 2 Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$, θυρας instead of πυλης. Ver. 25. ℵ. B. L. It^{aliq} Vg. read κυριε only once. Ver. 26. The MSS., αρξεσθε or αρξησθε. Ver. 27 B. T^{w}., λεγων instead of λεγω. ℵ. Vss. omit this word. B. L. R. T^{w}. omit υμας.

says Jesus: They will think it incredible that so great a number of Jews, with the ardent desire to have part in that kingdom, should not succeed in entering it. The word *πολλοί, many*, proves the connection between this discourse and the question of ver. 23. Only Jesus does not say whether there will be few or many saved; He confines Himself to saying that there will be many lost. This is the one important matter for practical and individual application. It is perfectly consistent with this truth that there should be many saved. The meaning of the expression, *will seek to enter in*, ver. 24, is explained at ver. 25 by the cries which are uttered, and the knockings at the gate; and the meaning of the words, *but shall not be able*, ver. 24, is explained by vers. 26 and 27, which describe the futility of those efforts.

It is not possible to connect the *ἀφ' οὗ, when once*, with the preceding phrase; the period would drag intolerably. The principal proposition on which this conjunction depends must therefore be sought in what follows. This might be *καὶ ἀρξεσθε* (not *ἀρξησθε*), ver. 25*b*: "When once the Master has risen . . . ye shall begin, *on your side* (*καί*), . . .;" or *καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ἐρεῖ* at the end of the same ver. 25: "He, *on His side* (*καί*), shall answer and say . . .;" or, finally, and most naturally of all, the apodosis may be placed, as we have put it in our translation, at ver. 26, in the words: *τότε ἀρξεσθε: then ye shall begin.* The word *then* favors this construction. The decisive act of the Master in rising from His seat to shut the door symbolizes the fact that conversion and pardon are no longer possible (*ἀφ' οὗ, when once*). What moment is this? Is it that of the rejection and dispersion of Israel? No: for the Jews did not then begin to cry and to knock according to the description of ver. 25. Is it the time of the Parousia, when the great Messianic festival shall open? No; for the Jews then living shall be converted and received into the palace. The words, *when ye shall see* (ver. 28), strikingly recall a similar feature in the parable of the wicked rich man, that in which this unhappy one is represented in Hades contemplating from afar the happiness of Lazarus in Abraham's bosom. We are thereby led to apply what follows ("when ye shall see Abraham . . ." ver. 23) to the judgment which Jesus pronounces at present on the unbelieving Jews, excluding them in the life to come from all participation in the blessings of salvation. Gess: "The house where Jesus waits can be no other than heaven; it is the souls of the dead who remind him, ver. 26, of the relations which He had with them on the earth." This ver. 26 indicates the tendency to rest salvation on certain external religious advantages: "Thou wast one of ourselves; we cannot perish." Is there in the words, *I know not whence ye are* (ver. 27), an allusion to the false confidence which the Jews put in their natural descent from Abraham?

Vers. 28–30.* "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out. 29. And they shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God. 30. And, behold, there are last which shall be first, and there are first which shall be last." Wailings express despair, gnashings of teeth rage. The souls of the condemned oscillate between those two feelings. The article before the two substantives has the force of setting aside all former similar impressions as comparatively insignificant. Messianic blessedness is represented in ver. 28, according to a figure

* Ver. 28. Marcion substituted for the enumeration, ver. 28: *παντας τους δικαιους*, and omitted vers. 29 and 30.

familiar among the Jews (14 : 15), under the image of a banquet presided over by the patriarchs. From ver. 29 it follows that the believing Gentiles are admitted as well as the faithful posterity of Abraham. Thus there are really many persons saved. The words *and behold* (ver. 30) refer to the surprise produced by this entire reversal of position. The *last* here are not those who, within the confines of the kingdom, occupy the last place ; they are, as the context proves, those who are excluded from it ; they are in the last place, absolutely speaking. The first are all the saved. The first proposition evidently applies to the Gentiles who are admitted (ver. 29), the second to the Jews who are rejected (vers. 27 and 28).

Sayings similar to those of vers. 25–27 are found in Matt. 7, at the end of the Sermon on the Mount, also in 25 : 10–12 and 30. There is nothing to prevent us from regarding them as uttered on a different occasion. Those of ver. 28 and 29 appear in Matt. 8 : 11, 12, immediately after the cure of the centurion's son. But they are not so well accounted for there as in the context of Luke. The apophthegm of ver. 30 forms (Matt. 19 : 30 and 20 : 16) the preface and the conclusion of the parable of the laborers called at different hours. In this context, *the last* who become *the first* are manifestly the laborers who, having come later, find themselves privileged to receive the same hire ; *the first* who become *the last* are those who, having wrought from the beginning of the day, are thereby treated less advantageously. Is this sense natural? Is not the application of those expressions in Luke to the rejected Jews and admitted Gentiles more simple? The Epistles to the Galatians and to the Romans are the only true commentary on this piece, and on the sayings of vers. 28 and 29 in particular. Now, as the historical truth of the whole passage is certified by the parallel of Matthew, we have a clear proof that the gospel of Paul no way differed in substance from that of Jesus and the Twelve.

2. *The Farewell to the Theocracy :* 13 : 31–35. When the heart is full of some one feeling, everything which tells upon it from without calls forth the expression of it. And so, at the time when the mind of Jesus is specially occupied about the future of His people, it is not surprising that this feeling comes to light with every circumstance which supervenes. There is therefore no reason why this perfectly natural fact should be taken to prove a systematic arrangement originating with Luke.

Vers. 31–33.* "The same day there came certain of the Pharisees, saying unto Him, Get thee out, and depart hence ; for Herod will kill thee. 32. And He said unto them, Go ye and tell that fox, Behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected. 33. Nevertheless, I must walk to-day, and to-morrow, and the day following ; for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem." We cannot help being surprised at seeing the Pharisees interesting themselves in the safety of Jesus, and we are naturally led to suspect a feint, if not a secret understanding with Herod. Already at a much earlier date Mark (3 : 6) had showed us the Herodians and Pharisees plotting together. Is not something of the same kind now repeated? Herod, on whose conscience there already weighed the murder of a prophet, was not anxious to commit another crime of the same sort ; but no more did he wish to see this public activity of Jesus, of which his dominions had been for some time the theatre, and the popular excitement which accompanied it, indefinitely prolonged. As to the Pharisees, it was natural that

* Ver. 31. 7 Mjj. (Alex.) 15 Mnn., *ωρα* instead of *ημερα*. Ver. 32. ℵ. B. L. 2 Mnn., *αποτελω* instead of *επιτελω*. B. some Mnn. Vss. add *ημερα* after *τριτη*. Ver. 33. ℵ. D. Λ. some Mnn., *ερχομενη* instead of *εχομενη*.

they should seek to draw Jesus to Judea, where He would fall more directly under the power of the Sanhedrim. It had been agreed, therefore, to bring this lengthened journey to an end by terrifying Jesus. He penetrates their intrigue; and hence He addresses His reply to Herod Himself, making the Pharisees at the same time His message-bearers, as they had been the king's message-bearers to him. "I see well on whose part you come. Go and answer Herod . . ." Thus also the epithet *fox*, which He applies to this prince, finds its explanation. Instead of issuing a command, as becomes a king, he degrades himself to play the part of an intriguer. Not daring to show the teeth of the lion, he uses the tricks of the fox. Fault has been found with Jesus for speaking with so little respect of the prince of His people. But it must be remembered that Herod was the creature of Cæsar, and not the lawful heir of David's throne.

The meaning of the first part of the answer (ver. 32*b*) is this: "Reassure thyself, thou who seekest to terrify me; my present activity in no way threatens thy power; I am not a Messiah such as he whose appearance thou dreadest; some devils cast out, some cures accomplished, such is all my work in thy dominions. And to complete the assuring of thee, I promise thee that it shall not be long; to-day, to-morrow, and a day more; then it will be at an end." These last words symbolically express the idea of a very short time; comp. Hos. 6 : 2. We may regard τελειοῦμαι either, with Bleek, as Attic fut. mid., or, what seems simpler, as a pres. mid. used for the fut. to designate what is immediately imminent. The term so near can be none other than that of His life; comp. 33*b*. Bleek and others give τελειοῦμαι the active meaning: "I close [my ministry in Galilee]." But the word τελειοῦμαι in this context is too solemn to suit this almost superfluous sense. The Alex. reading ἀποτελῶ, *I finish*, does not so well correspond to the parallel term ἐκβάλλω, *I cast out*, as the received reading ἐπιτελῶ, *I work*. It is probably owing to a retrospective influence of the word τελειοῦμαι.

Ver. 33. Short as the time is which is allowed to Jesus, it remains none the less true (πλήν) that He will quietly pursue His present journey, and that no one will force Him to bring His progress and work hastily to an end. The δεῖ, *I must*, which refers to the decree of Heaven, justifies this mode of acting. Πορεύεσθαι, *to travel*, the emblem of life and action; this word is opposed to τελειοῦμαι, which designates the time at which the journeying ends. Τῇ ἐχομένῃ (*the day following*), ver. 33, corresponds to τῇ τρίτῃ (*the third day*), ver. 32; Jesus means: "I have only three days; but I have them, and no one will cut them short." Wieseler takes the three days literally, and thinks that at the time when Jesus thus spoke He was but three days' journey from Bethany, whither he was repairing. It would be difficult to reduce so weighty a saying to greater poverty of meaning. Bleek, who does not succeed in overcoming the difficulty of this enigmatical utterance, proposes to suppress in ver. 33 the words σήμερον καὶ αὔριον καί as a very old interpolation. No document supports this supposition, which would have the effect of mutilating one of the most striking declarations of our Lord.

The last words of ver. 33 are the answer of Jesus to the Pharisees. They, too, may reassure themselves; their prey will not escape them. Jerusalem has the monopoly of killing the prophets, and on this highest occasion the city will not be deprived of its right. The word ἐνδέχεται, *it is possible*, contains, like the entire saying, a scathing irony: "It is not suitable; it would be contrary to use and wont, and, in a manner, to theocratic decorum, if such a prophet as I should perish elsewhere than

in Jerusalem !" No doubt John the Baptist had perished away from that city. But such ironies must not be taken in the strict letter. Jerusalem could not let her privilege be twice taken from her in so short a time ! The relation indicated by ὅτι, *for*, is this : " I know that the time which is at my disposal in favor of Galilee will not be cut short by my death ; for I am not to die elsewhere than at Jerusalem . . ." According to Holtzmann this passage, peculiar to Luke and taken from A, was omitted by Matthew because of its obscurity. Must he not have omitted many others for the same reason ?

Already, vers. 4, 5, on occasion of an event which more particularly concerned the Galileans, the mind of Jesus had been directed toward Jerusalem. Now the thought of this capital, become, as it were, the executioner of the prophets, takes possession of His heart. His grief breaks forth ; the prelude to the tears of Palm-day.

Vers. 34 and 35.* " O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee ; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not ! 35. Behold, your house is left unto you. But I say unto you, ye shall not see me until the time come when ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord." It is surprising at first sight to find such an apostrophe to Jerusalem in the heart of Galilee. But were not the Pharisees whom Jesus had before Him the representatives of that capital ? Comp. 5 : 17 : " There were Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by, which were come out of every town of Galilee, and Judea, and Jerusalem." Had He not been setting their minds at rest as such ? Such an apostrophe to Jerusalem, regarded from a distance, has something about it more touching than if He had already been within its walls. In Matt. 23 : 37 it is placed, during his sojourn at Jerusalem, on one of the days preceding the Passion, and at the point when Jesus leaves the temple for the last time. This situation is grand and tragic ; but is it not probable that this placing of the passage was due to the certainly too narrow application (see below) of the expression *your house* (ver. 35) to the temple ? The words *thy children* have been applied by Baur not to the inhabitants of Jerusalem only, but to all Israelites, Galileans included ; and he denies, consequently, that this saying could serve to prove the conclusion which has often been drawn from it, viz. that the narrative of the Syn. implies the numerous sojourns at Jerusalem which are related by John. But the relation of ver. 34 to the latter part of ver. 33 compels us to restrict the meaning of the word to the inhabitants of Jerusalem ; its only admissible sense also in Luke 19 : 44 ; and, taken by itself, its only natural sense. Only, it is assumed that the fate of the population of the capital involves in it that of the other inhabitants of the country.

The contrast between *I would* . . . and *ye would not* proves the sad privilege which man possesses of resisting the most earnest drawings of grace. As to Jesus, while mournfully asserting the futility of His efforts to save His people, He does not the less persevere in His work ; for He knows that, if it has not the result that it might and should have, it will have another, in which God will notwithstanding carry

* Ver. 34. The MSS. are divided between την νοσσιαν (Alex. and T. R.) and τα νοσσια (Byz. Syr. It$^{\text{plerique}}$). Ver. 35. T. R. adds ερημος after οικος υμων, with D. E. G. H. M. U. X. Δ. the most of the Mnn. Syr. It$^{\text{plerique}}$. All the Mjj., λεγω δε (א. L. without δε) instead of αμην δε λεγω, which T. R. reads with several Mnn. 6 Mjj. omit οτι. The MSS. are divided between εως (or εως αν) ηξη (or ηξει) οτι ειπητε (T. R.) and εως (or εως αν) ειπητε (Alex., according to Matthew).

out His plan to fulfilment. Some Jews saved shall become, in default of the nation as a whole, the instruments of the world's salvation. Jesus represents Himself, ver. 34, as a protector stretching His compassionate arms over the theocracy and its capital, because He knows well that He alone can rescue them from the catastrophe by which they are threatened. It is, in another form, the idea of the parable of the fig-tree (vers. 6–9). Now Israel rejects the protection which He offers. What more can Jesus do (ver. 35)? Leave to Israel the care of its own defence, that is to say—Jesus knows it well—give it up to a ruin which He alone could avert. Such is the meaning of the words, *your house is left unto you;* henceforth it is given over to your guardianship. Jesus frees Himself of the charge which His Father had confided to Him, the salvation of the theocracy. It is in its every feature the situation of the divine Shepherd in His last endeavor to save the flock of slaughter, Zach. 11 : 4–14. The application of the expression *your house* to the temple, in such a unity, must be felt to be much too special. The place in question is Canaan, the abode divinely granted to the people, and especially Jerusalem, the centre of the theocracy. The authenticity of the word ἔρημος, *desolate* (ver. 35), appears more than doubtful both in Matthew and Luke. If this word were authentic, it would refer to the withdrawal of Jesus' visible presence; comp. Ezek. 11, where the cloud rising from over the sanctuary passes eastward, and from that moment the temple is empty and desolate. But the government ὑμῖν, "is left to *you*," and the want of sufficient authorities, speak against this reading.

Like a bird of prey hovering in the air, the enemy is threatening the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Jesus, who was sheltering them under His wings as a hen her brood, withdraws, and they remain exposed, reduced thenceforth to defend themselves. The adversative form, *but I say unto you*, is certainly preferable to that of Matthew, *for I say unto you*. "I go away; *but I declare to you*, it will be for longer than you think; that my absence may be brought to an end, you yourselves, by the change of your sentiments in regard to me, will have to give the signal for my return." The words ἕως ἂν ἥξῃ, *until it come to pass that . . .*, are the true reading. This moral change will certainly (ἵνα) come about, but when (ἄν) it is impossible to say. Some commentators (Paulus, Wieseler, etc.) think that the time here pointed to is Palm-day, on which Jesus received the homage of part of the people, and particularly of the Galileans, to whom these sayings had been addressed. "Ye shall not see me again, ye Galileans, until we meet together on the occasion of my entry into Jerusalem." But how poor and insignificant would this meaning be, after the previous sayings! What bearing on the salvation of Israel had this separation of a few weeks? Besides, it was not to the Galileans that Jesus was speaking it was to the representatives of the pharisaic party (vers. 31–34). In Matthew's context, the interpretation of Wieseler is still more manifestly excluded. The words which Jesus here puts into the mouth of converted Israel in the end of the days, are taken from Ps. 118 : 26. This cry of penitent Israel will bring the Messiah down again, as the sigh of Israel, humbled and waiting for consolation, had led Him to appear the first time (Isa. 64 . 1). The announcement of the future return of Jesus, brought about by the faith of the people in His Messiahship (ὁ ἐρχόμενος), thus forms the counterpart to that of His near departure, caused by the national unbelief (τελειοῦμαι). How can any one fail to feel the appropriateness, the connection, the harmony of all the parts of this admirable answer? How palpable, at least in this case, is the decisive value of Luke's short introduction for the understanding of the whole piece! The important matter here,

as everywhere, is, above all, the precise indication of the interlocutors : "The same day there came *certain of the Pharisees*, saying . . ."

3. *Jesus at a Feast :* 14 : 1–24. The following piece allows us to follow Jesus in His domestic life and familiar conversations. It is connected with the preceding by the fact that it is with a Pharisee Jesus has to do. We are admitted to the entire scene : 1*st*. The entering into the house (vers. 1–6) ; 2*d*. The sitting down at table (vers. 7–11) ; 3*d*. Jesus conversing with His host about the choice of his guests (vers. 12–14 ; 4*th*. His relating the parable of the great supper, occasioned by the exclamation of one of the guests (vers. 15–24).

Holtzmann, of course, regards this frame as being to a large extent invented by Luke to receive the detached sayings of Jesus, which he found placed side by side in A. This is to suppose in Luke as much genius as unscrupulousness Weizsäcker, starting from the idea that the contents of this part are systematically arranged and frequently altered to meet the practical questions which were agitating the apostolic church at the date of Luke's composition, alleges that the whole of this chapter relates to the *agapæ* of the primitive Church, and is intended to describe those feasts as embodiments of brotherly love and pledges of the heavenly feast ; and he concludes therefrom, as from an established fact, the somewhat late origin of our Gospel. Where is the least trace of such an intention to be found ?

1*st*. Vers. 1–6.* To accept an invitation to the house of a Pharisee, after the previous scenes, was to do an act at once of courage and kindness. The host was one of the *chief* of his sect. There is no proof of the existence of a hierarchy in this party ; but one would naturally be formed by superiority of knowledge and talent. The interpretation of Grotius, who takes *τῶν Φαρισαίων* as in apposition to *τῶν ἀρχόντων*, is inadmissible. The guests it is said, watched Jesus. Ver. 2 indicates the trap which had been laid for Him ; and *ἰδού, behold*, marks the time when this unlooked-for snare is discovered to the eyes of Jesus. The picture is taken at the moment. The word *ἀποκριθείς, answering* (ver 3), alludes to the question implicitly contained in the sick man's presence : "Wilt thou heal, or wilt thou not heal ?" Jesus replies by a counter question, as at 6 : 9. The silence of His adversaries betrays their bad faith. The reading *ὄνος, ass*, in the *Sinaiticus* and some MSS. (ver 5), arises no doubt from the connection with *βοῦς, ox*, or from the similar saying, 13 : 15. The true reading is *υἱός, son :* "If thy son, or even thine ox only . . ." In this word *son*, as in the expression *daughter of Abraham* (13 : 16), there is revealed a deep feeling of tenderness for the sufferer. We cannot overlook a correspondence between the malady (dropsy) and the supposed accident (falling into a pit). Comp. 13 : 15, 16, the correspondence between the halter with which the ox is fastened to the stall, and the bond by which Satan holds the sufferer in subjection. Here again we find the perfect suitableness, even in the external drapery, which characterizes the declarations of our Lord. In Matt. 12 : 11 this figure is applied to the curing of a man who has a withered hand. It is less happy, and is certainly inexact.

* Ver. 3. ℵ. B. D. L. omit *ει* before *εξεστιν*, and, with several Mnn. and Vss., they add *η ου* after *θεραπευσαι* (T. R., *θεραπευειν*). Ver. 5. 6 Mjj. 15 Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique}, omit *αποκριθεις* before *προς αυτους*. A. B. E. G. H. M. S. U. V. Γ. Δ. Λ. 130 Mnn. Syr. It$^{aliq.}$ read *υιος* instead of *ονος*, which ℵ. K. L. X. Π. some Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ Vg. read. The MSS. are divided between *εμπεσειται* (T. R.) and *πεσειται* (Alex.) Ver. 6. ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn. omit *αυτω* after *ανταποκριθηναι*.

2*d*. Vers. 7–11.* Here is the point at which the guests seat themselves at table The recommendation contained in this passage is not, as has often been thought, a counsel of worldly prudence. Holtzmann ascribes this meaning, if not to the Lord, at least to Luke. But the very term *parable* (ver. 7) and the adage of ver. 11 protest against this supposition, and admit of our giving to the saying no other than a religious sense and a spiritual application ; comp. 18 : 14. In a winning and appropriate form Jesus gives the guests a lesson in humility, in the deepest sense of the word. Every one ought in heart to take, and ever take again, the last place before God, or as St. Paul says, Phil. 2 : 3, to regard others *as better than himself*. The judgment of God will perhaps be different ; but in this way we run no other risk than that of being exalted. Ἐπέχων, fixing His attention on that habitual way of acting among the Pharisees (Luke 20 : 46). Ewald and Holtzmann darken counsel about the word *wedding* (ver. 8), which does not suit a simple repast like this. But Jesus in this verse is not speaking of the present repast, but of a supposed feast. The proper reading is ἀνάπεσε, not ἀνάπεσαι—this verb has no middle—or ἀνάπεσον, which has only a few authorities. *In the lowest place* (ver. 10), because in the interval all the intermediate seats had been occupied. The expression, *thou shalt have glory*, would be puerile, if it did not open up a glimpse of a *heavenly* reality.

3*d*. Ver. 12–14.† The company is seated. Jesus, then observing that the guests in general belonged to the upper classes of society, addresses to His host a lesson on charity, which He clothes, like the preceding, in the graceful form of a recommendation of intelligent self-interest. The μήποτε, *lest* (ver. 12), carries a tone of liveliness and almost of pleasantry · "Beware of it; it is a misfortune to be avoided. For, once thou shalt have received human requital, it is all over with divine recompense." Jesus does not mean to forbid our entertaining those whom we love. He means simply : in view of the life to come, thou canst do better still. Ἀνάπηροι, those who are deprived of some one sense or limb, most frequently the blind or the lame ; here, where those two categories are specially mentioned, the *maimed* in general. In itself, the expression *resurrection of the just*, ver. 14, does not necessarily imply a distinction between two resurrections, the one of the just exclusively, the other general ; it might signify merely, when the just shall rise at the inauguration of the Messianic kingdom. But as Luke 20 : 35 evidently proves that this distinction was in the mind of Jesus,‡ it is natural to explain the term from this point of view (comp. 1 Cor. 15 : 23 ; 1 Thess. 4 : 16 ; Phil. 3 : 11 ; Rev. 20.)

4*th*. Vers. 15–24. The conversation which follows belongs to a later time in the feast. Jesus had been depicting the just seated at the Messiah's banquet, and receiving a superabundant equivalent for the least works of love which they have performed here below. This saying awakes in the heart of one of the guests a sweet anticipation of heavenly joys ; or perhaps he seizes it as an occasion for laying a snare for Jesus, and leading Him to utter some heresy on the subject. The severe tendency of the following parable might favor this second interpretation. In any case, the enumeration of ver. 21 (comp. ver. 13) proves the close connection between those two parts of the conversation.

* Ver. 10. ℵ. B. L. X. some Mnn., ερει instead of ειπη. ℵ. A. B. L. X. 12 Mnn. Syr. add παντων before των συνανακειμενων.

† Ver. 14. ℵ. 5 Mnn. Ital., δε instead of γαρ after ανταποδοθησεται.

‡ That this was in the mind of Jesus is not evident to interpreters generally. In this, and in one or two other passages, the author is less clear than is usual with him regarding the events of the future.—J. H.

Vers. 15–20.*—Ἄρτον φαγεσθαι (fut. of φάγω) merely signifies, to be admitted to the heavenly feast. There is no allusion in the expression to the excellence of the meats which shall form this repast (ver. 1). Jesus replies, "Yes, blessed; and therefore beware of rejecting the blessedness at the very moment when thou art extolling its greatness." Such is the application of the following parable. The word πολλούς, significant of numerous guests, ver. 16, is sufficiently justified when applied to the Jewish people alone; for this invitation includes all divine advances, at all periods of the theocracy. The last call given to the guests (ver. 17) relates to the ministries of John the Baptist and of Jesus Himself. It cannot be proved that it was usual to send a message at the last moment; but the hour was come, and nobody appeared. This touch brings out the ill-will of those invited; there was no possibility of their forgetting. The expression, *all things are ready*, describes the glorious freeness of salvation. The excuses put forth by the invited, vers. 18–20, are not in earnest; for, warned as they were long beforehand, they could have chosen another day for their different occupations. The choice made, which is at the bottom of those refusals, betrays itself in the uniformity of their answers. It is like a refrain (ἀπὸ μιᾶς, understand: φωνῆς or γνώμης, ver. 18). They have passed the word to one another. The true reason is evidently the antipathy which they feel to him who invites them; comp. John 15 : 24: "They have hated both me and my Father."

Vers. 21–24.† In the report which the servant gives of his mission, we may hear, as Stier so well observes, the echo of the sorrowful lamentations uttered by Jesus over the hardening of the Jews during His long nights of prayer. The *anger* of the master (ὀργισθείς) is the retaliation for the hatred which he discovers at the bottom of their refusals. The first supplementary invitation which he commissions his servant to give, represents the appeal addressed by Jesus to the lowest classes of Jewish society, those who are called, 15 : 1, *publicans and sinners*. Πλατειαι, the larger streets, which widen out into squares. Ῥῦμαι, the small cross streets. There is no going out yet from the city. The second supplementary invitation (vers. 22 and 23) represents the calling of the Gentiles; for those to whom it is addressed are no longer inhabitants of the city. The love of God is great: it requires a multitude of guests; it will not have a seat left empty. The number of the elect is, as it were, determined beforehand by the riches of divine glory, which cannot find a complete reflection without a certain number of human beings. The invitation will therefore be continued, and consequently the history of our race prolonged, until that number be reached. Thus the divine decree is reconciled with human liberty. In comparison with the number called, there are undoubtedly few saved through the fault of the former; but nevertheless, speaking absolutely, there are very many saved. Φραγμοί, the hedges which enclose properties, and beneath which vagrants squat. The phrase, *compel them to come in*, applies to people who would like to enter, but are yet kept back by a false timidity. The servant is to push them, in a manner, into the house *in spite of their scruples*. The object, therefore, is not to extinguish their liberty, but rather to restore them to it. For they would; but they dare not. As ver. 21 is the

* Ver. 15. The Mnn. are divided between ος (T. R.) and οστις (Alex.) before φαγεται. Instead of αρτον, some Mjj. (Byz.) 130 Mnn. Syr$^{cur.}$, αριστον. Ver. 16. ℵ. B. R. Syr$^{cur.}$, εποιει instead of εποιησεν. Ver. 17. ℵ* B. L. R. It$^{aliq.}$ omit παντα after εστιν (or εισιν).

† Ver. 21. 9 Mjj. 12 Mnn. It. Vg. omit εκεινος after δουλος. Ver. 22. ℵ. B. D. L. R. Syr$^{cur.}$, ο instead of ως before επεταξας.

text of the first part of Acts (1 : 12, conversion of the Jews), vers. 22 and 23 are the text of the second (13 to the end, conversion of the Gentiles), and indeed of the whole present economy. Weizsäcker accuses Luke of having added to the original parable this distinction between two new invitations, and that in favor of Paul's mission to the Gentiles. If this saying were the only one which the evangelists put into the mouth of Jesus regarding the calling of the Gentiles, this suspicion would be conceivable. But does not the passage 13 : 28–30 already express this idea? and is not this saying found in Matthew as well as in Luke? Comp. also Matt. 24 : 14; John 10 : 16. According to several commentators, ver. 24 does not belong to the parable; it is the application of it addressed by Jesus to all the guests ("I say unto you"). But the subject of the verb, *I say*, is evidently still the host of the parable; the pron. *you* designates the persons gathered round him at the time when he gives this order. Only the solemnity with which Jesus undoubtedly passed His eyes over the whole assembly, while putting this terrible threat into the mouth of the master in the parable, made them feel that at that very moment the scene described was actually passing between Him and them.

The parable of the great feast related Matt. 22 : 1–14 has great resemblances to this; but it differs from it as remarkably. More generalized in the outset, it becomes toward the end more detailed, and takes even a somewhat complex character. It may be, as Bleek thinks, a combination of two parables originally distinct. This seems to be proved by certain touches, such as the royal dignity of the host, the destruction by his armies of the city inhabited by those first invited, and then everything relating to the man who had come in without a wedding garment. Nothing, on the contrary, could be more simple and complete than the delineation of Luke.

4. *A Warning against hasty Professions;* 14 : 25–35. The journey resumes its course; great crowds follow Jesus. There is consequently an attraction to His side. This appears in the plurals ὄχλοι, *multitudes*, the adjective πολλοί, and the imperfect of duration συνεπορεύοντο, *were accompanying Him*. This brief introduction, as in similar cases, gives the key to the following discourse, which embraces: 1*st*. A warning (vers. 26 and 27); 2*d*. Two parables (vers. 28–32); 3*d*. A conclusion, clothed in a new figure (vers. 33–35).

Vers. 25–27.* "And there went great multitudes with Him; and He turned, and said unto them, 26. If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. 27. And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple." Seeing those crowds Jesus is aware that between Him and them there is a misunderstanding. The Gospel, rightly apprehended, will not be the concern of the multitude. He lifts His voice to reveal this false situation: You are going up with me to Jerusalem, as if you were repairing to a feast. But do you know what it is for a man to join himself to my company? It is to abandon what is dearest and most vital (ver. 26), and to accept what is most painful—the cross (ver. 27). *Coming to me* (ver. 26) denotes outward attachment to Jesus; *being my disciple*, at the end of the verse, actual dependence on His person and spirit. That the former may be changed into the latter, and that the bond between Jesus and the professor may be durable, there must be effected in him a painful breach with everything which is

* Ver. 27. This verse is omitted by M. R. Γ. and very many Mnn. (by *homoioteleuton*). ℵ. B. L. Cop. omit και before οστις.

naturally dear to him. The word *hate* in this passage is often interpreted in the sense of *loving less*. Bleek quotes examples, which are not without force. Thus, Gen. 29 : 30, 31. It is also the meaning of Matthew's paraphrase (10 : 37), ὁ φιλῶν . . . ὑπὲρ ἐμέ. Yet it is simpler to keep the natural sense of the word hate, if it offers an admissible application. And this we find when we admit that Jesus is here regarding the well-beloved ones whom He enumerates as representatives of our natural life, that life, strictly and radically selfish, which separates us from God. Hence He adds : *Yea, and his own life also ;* this word forms the key to the understanding of the word *hate*. At bottom, our *own* life is the only thing to be hated. Everything else is to be hated only in so far as it partakes of this principle of sin and death. According to Deut. 21 : 18–21, when a man showed himself determinedly vicious or impious, his father and mother were to be the first to take up stones to stone him. Jesus in this place only spiritualizes this precept. The words : *Yea, and his own life also,* thus remove from this hatred every notion of sin, and allow us to see in it nothing but an aversion of a purely moral kind.

There are not only affections to be sacrificed, bonds to be broken ; there are sufferings to be undergone in the following of Jesus. The emblem of these positive evils is the cross, that punishment the most humiliating and painful of all, which had been introduced into Israel since the Roman subjugation. Without supplying an οὐκ before ἐρχεται, we might translate : "Whosoever doth not bear . . . and who nevertheless cometh after me . . ." But this interpretation is far from natural. Those well-disposed crowds who were following Jesus without real conversion had never imagined anything like this. Jesus sets before their very eyes these two indispensable conditions of true faith by two parables (ver. 28–32).

Vers. 28–30.* *The Improvident Builder.* Building here is the image of the Christian life, regarded in its positive aspect : the foundation and development of the work of God in the heart and life of the believer. The tower, a lofty edifice which strikes the eye from afar, represents a mode of living distinguished from the common, and attracting general attention. New professors often regard with complacency what distinguishes them outwardly from the world. But building costs something ; and the work once begun must be finished, under penalty of being exposed to public ridicule. One should therefore have first made his estimates, and accepted the inroad upon his capital which will result from such an undertaking. His capital is his own life, which he is called to spend, and to spend wholly in the service of his sanctification. The work of God is not seriously pursued, unless a man is daily sacrificing some part of that which constitutes the natural fortune of the human heart, particularly the affections, which are so deep, referred to, ver. 26. Before, therefore, any one puts himself forward as a professor, it is all important that he should have calculated this future expenditure, and thoroughly made up his mind not to recoil from any of those sacrifices which fidelity will entail. *Sitting down* and *counting* are emblems of the serious acts of recollection and meditation which should precede a true profession. This was precisely what Jesus had done in the wilderness. But what happens when this condition is neglected ? After having energetically pronounced himself, the new professor recoils step by step from the consequences of the position which he has taken up. He stops short in the sacrifice of his natural life ; and this inconsistency pro-

* Ver. 28. B. D. L. R. It$^{aliq.}$ omit τα, and the same with 13 other Mjj. 50 Mnn. read εις instead of προς before απαρτισμον. T. R., τα προς απαρτισμον, with F. V. X. Π. many Mnn.

vokes the contempt and ridicule of the world, which soon discovers that he who had separated himself from it with so much parade, is after all but one of its own. Nothing injures the gospel like those relapses, the ordinary results of hasty profession.

Vers. 31, 32.* *The Improvident Warrior.* Here we have an emblem of the Christian life, regarded on its negative or polemical side. The Christian is a king, but a king engaged in a struggle, and a struggle with an enemy materially stronger than himself. Therefore, before defying him with a declaration of war by the open profession of the gospel, a man must have taken counsel with himself, and become assured that he is willing to accept the extreme consequences of this position, even to the giving up of his life if demanded; this condition is expressed ver. 27 Would not a little nation like the Swiss bring down ridicule on itself by declaring war with France, if it were not determined to die nobly on the field of battle? Would not Luther have acted like a fool when he affixed his theses to the church door, or burned the Papal bull, had he not first made the sacrifice of his life in the inner court of his heart? It is heroical to engage in a struggle for a just and holy cause, but on one condition: that is, that we have accepted death beforehand as the end of the way; otherwise this declaration of war is nothing but rodomontade. The words: *whether he is able*, have a slight touch of irony; able to conquer, and, as under such conditions that is impossible, to die in the unequal struggle. Ver. 32 has been regarded either as a call to us to take account of our weakness, that we may ask the help of God (Olshausen), or a summons promptly to seek reconciliation with God (Gerlach). Both interpretations are untenable, because the hostile king challenged by the declaration of war is not God, but the prince of this world. It is therefore much rather a warning which Jesus gives to those who profess discipleship, but who have not decided to risk everything, to make their submission as early as possible to the world and its prince. Better avoid celebrating a Palm-day than end after such a demonstration with a Good Friday! Rather remain an honorable man, unknown religiously, than become what is sadder in the world, an inconsistent Christian. A warning, therefore, to those who formed the attendants of Jesus, to make their peace speedily with the Sanhedrim, if they are not resolved to follow their new Master to the cross! Jesus drew this precept also from His own experience. He had made his reckoning in the wilderness with the prince of this world, and with life, before beginning His work publicly. Gess rightly says: "Those two parables show with what seriousness Jesus had Himself prepared for death."

Vers. 33–35.† *The Application of those two Parables, with a new Figure confirming it.*—"So likewise, whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple. 34. Salt is good: but if the salt have lost his savor, wherewith shall it be seasoned? 35. It is neither fit for the land, nor yet for the dunghill; but men cast it out. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear. Here is the summing up of the warning which was intended to calm the unreflecting enthusiasm of those multitudes. The expression: *forsaketh all that he hath*, natural life, as well as all the affections and all the goods fitted to satisfy it, sums up the two conditions indicated vers. 26 (the giving up of enjoyment) and 27 (the acceptance of the cross). Salt (ver. 34) corrects the tastelessness of certain substances, and preserves others from corrup-

* Ver. 31. ℵ. B. It^{plerique}, *βουλευσεται* instead of *βουλευεται*. The MSS. are divided between *απαντησαι* (T R.) and *υπαντησαι* (Alex.).

† Ver. 34. ℵ. B. L. X. some Mnn. add *ουν* after *καλον*. ℵ. B. D. L. X. 8 Mnn. It^{plerique}, *εαν δε και* instead of *εαν δε*.

tion ; the marvellous efficacy of this agent on materials subjected to its quickening energy is a good thing, and even good to observe (*καλόν*). In this twofold relation it is the emblem of the sharp and austere savor of holiness, of the action of the gospel on the natural life, the insipidity and frivolity of which are corrected by the Divine Spirit. No more beautiful spectacle in the moral world than this action of the gospel through the instrumentality of the consistent Christian on the society around him. But if the Christian himself by his unfaithfulness destroys this holy power, no means will restore to him the savor which it was his mission to impart to the world. *Ἀρτυθήσεται* might be taken impersonally : "If there is no more salt, wherewith shall men salt (things)?" But Jesus is not here describing the evil results of Christian unfaithfulness to the world or the gospel ; it is the professor himself who is concerned (ver. 35 : *men cast it out*). The subject of the verb is therefore, *ἅλας*, salt itself ; comp. Mark 9 : 50 : *ἐν τίνι ἀρτύσετε αὐτό* ; "wherewith will ye season *it*?" Salt which has become savorless is fit for nothing ; it cannot serve the soil as earth, nor pasture as dung. It is only good to be *cast out*, says Luke ; *trodden under foot of men*, says Matt. 5 : 13. Salt was sometimes used to cover slippery ways (Erub. f. 104. 1 : *Spargunt salem in clivo ne nutent* (pedes). A reserved attitude toward the gospel is therefore a less critical position than an open profession followed by declension. In the moral as in the physical world, without previous heating there is no deadly chill. Jesus seems to say that the life of nature may have its usefulness in the kingdom of God, either in the form of mundane (land) respectability, or even as a life completely corrupted and depraved (dung). In the first case, indeed, it is the soil wherein the germ of the higher life may be sown ; and in the second, it may at least call forth a moral reaction among those who feel indignation or disgust at the evil, and drive them to seek life from on high ; while the unfaithfulness of the Christian disgusts men with the gospel itself. The expression : *cast out* (give over to perdition, John 15 : 6), forms the transition to the final call : *He that hath ears* . . .

This discourse is the basis of the famous passage, Heb. 6 : 4–8. The commentators who have applied it to the rejection of the Jews have not sufficiently considered the context, and especially the introduction, ver. 25, which, notwithstanding Holtzmann's contemptuous treatment, is, as we have just seen, the key of the whole piece. Matthew places the apophthegm, vers. 34, 35, in that passage of the Sermon on the Mount where the grandeur of the Christian calling is described (5 : 13-16). Perhaps he was led to put it there by the analogy of the saying to the immediately following one : "Ye are the light of the world." Mark places it, like Luke, toward the end of the Galilean ministry (9 : 50) ; and such a warning is better explained at a more advanced period. Besides, like so many other general maxims, it may perfectly well have been uttered twice.

5. *The Parables of Grace :* chap. 15. This piece contains : 1*st.* A historical introduction (vers. 1 and 2) ; 2*d.* A pair of parables, like that of the previous chapter (vers. 3-10) ; and 3*d.* A great parable, which forms the summing up and climax of the two preceding (vers. 11-32). The relation is like that between the three allegories, John 10 : 1–18.

1*st.* Vers. 1 and 2.* *The Introduction.*—If Weizsäker had sufficiently weighed the bearing of the analytical from *ἦσαν ἐγγίζοντες*, *they were drawing near*, which denotes a state of things more or less permanent, he would not have accused Luke (p. 139) of transforming into the event of a particular time a very common situation in the life

* Ver. 2. ℵ. B. D. L. add *τε* after *οι*.

of Jesus. It is on the basis of this habitual state of things that the point of time (aor. εἶπε, ver. 3) is marked off when Jesus related the following parables. Holtzmann finds nothing in this introduction but an invention of Luke himself.. In any case, Luke places us once more, by this short historical introduction, at the point of view for understanding the whole of the following discourse. What drew those sinners to Jesus was their finding in Him not that righteousness, full of pride and contempt, with which the Pharisees assailed them, but a holiness which was associated with the tenderest love. The publicans and sinners had broken with Levitical purity and Israelitish respectability ; the former by their business, the others by their life. They were outlaws in Israel. But were they finally lost on that account? Undoubtedly, the normal way of entering into union with God would have been through fidelity to the theocracy ; but the coming of the Saviour opened another to those who, by their guilt, had shut the first against them. And that was exactly the thing which had exasperated the zealots of Levitical observances. Rather than recognize in Jesus one who had understood the merciful purpose of God, they preferred to explain the compassionate welcome which He gave to sinners by His secret sympathy with sin. Προσδέχεσθαι, *to receive with welcome*, refers to kindly relations in general : συνεσθίειν, *to eat with*, to the decisive act in the manners of that time by which He did not fear to seal this connection.

2*d*. Ve s. 3–10. The two parables of the *lost sheep* and of the *lost drachma*, as such pairs of parables always do, present the same idea, but in two different aspects. The idea common to both is the solicitude of God for sinners ; the difference is, that in the first instance this solicitude arises from the compassion with which *their misery* inspires Him, in the second from the *value* which He attaches to their persons. The two descriptions are intended to show that the conduct of Jesus toward those despised beings corresponds in all respects to that compassionate solicitude, and so to justify the instrument of divine love. If God cannot be accused of secret sympathy with sin, how could Jesus possibly be so when carrying His purpose into execution ?

Vers. 3–7.* *The Lost Sheep.* God seeks sinners because the sinner is a miserable being deserving pity : such is the meaning of this description. The parable is put in the form of a question. In point of fact, it is at once an *argumentum ad hominem* and an argument *a fortiori :* " What do ye yourselves in such a case? And besides, the case is like : a sheep, a man !" *Which of you?* " There is not a single one of you who accuse me here who does not act exactly like me in similar circumstances." Ἄνθρωπος, *man*, is tactily contrasted with God (ver. 7). The *hundred sheep* represent the totality of the theocratic people ; the *lost sheep*, that portion of the people which has broken with legal ordinances, and so lives under the impulse of its own passions ; the *ninety and nine*, the majority which has remained outwardly faithful to the law. Ἔρημος, which we translate *wilderness* simply denotes in the East uncultivated plains, pasturage, in opposition to tilled fields. It is the natural resort of sheep, but without the notion of danger and barrenness which we connect with the idea of wilderness. This place where the flock feeds represents the more or less normal state of the faithful Jews, in which the soul is kept near to God under the shelter of commandments and worship. The shepherd *leaves* them there : there have only to walk faithfully in the way marked out for them ; they will be infallibly led on to a higher state (John 3 : 21, 5 : 46, 6 : 45, 7 : 17). While waiting, their moral position is safe enough to

* Ver. 4. 6 Mjj. several Mnn. add *ov* after *εως*.

allow the Saviour to consecrate Himself more specially to the souls of those who, having broken with the covenant and its means of grace, are exposed to the most imminent dangers. The anxiety of the shepherd to recover a strayed sheep has more than personal interest for its motive. One sheep in a hundred is a loss of too small importance, and in any case out of proportion to the pains which he takes. The motive which animates him is compassion Is there, in reality, a creature in the animal world more to be pitied than a strayed sheep? It is destitute both of the instinct necessary to find its way, and of every weapon of self-defence. It is a prey to any beast which may meet it; it deserves, as no other being in nature, the name of *lost*. The compassion of the shepherd appears: 1. In his preseverance: he seeks it *until* (ver. 4); 2. In his tender care: he *layeth it on his shoulders;* 3. In the *joy* with which he takes his burden (ἐπιτίθησιν χαίρων), a joy such that he wishes to share it with those who surround him, and that he reckons on receiving their congratulations (ver. 6).

Every touch in this exquisite picture finds its application by means of the situation described, vers. 1 and 2. The search for the sheep corresponds with the act which the Pharisees blamed: *He receiveth sinners, and eateth with them;* the finding, to that moment of unspeakable joy, when Jesus sees one of those lost souls returning to God; the tenderness with which the shepherd carries his sheep, to the care which divine grace will henceforth take of the soul thus recovered for God; the joy of the shepherd, to that which Jesus, that which God Himself, feels in the salvation of sinners; the congratulations of friends and neighbors, to the thanksgivings and praises of glorified men and angels. It is to be remarked that the shepherd does not carry back the sheep to the pasture, but to his own dwelling. By this touch, Jesus undoubtedly gives us to understand, that the sinners whom He has come to save are transported by Him into an order of things superior to that of the theocracy to which they formerly belonged—into the communion of heaven represented by the shepherd's house (ver. 7).

Ver. 7 contains the application of the description, or more exactly, the conclusion of the argument: "If pity leads you to show such tenderness to a sheep, am I wrong in showing it to lost souls? I say unto you, that what I feel and do is what God Himself feels and wishes; and what offends you here below on the earth is what causes rejoicing in the heavens. It is for you to judge from this contrast, whether, while you have no need perhaps to change your life, you do not need a change of heart!" The words: *there shall be more joy*, are frequently explained *anthropopathically;* the recovery of a lost object gives us in the first moment a livelier joy than anything which we possess without previous loss. If we found this feature in the parable, the explanation might be discussed. But it meets us in the application, and we cannot see how such a sentiment could be absolutely ascribed to God. We have just seen that the state of the recovered sinner is really superior to that of the believing Israelite. The latter, without having to charge himself with gross disorders (μετανοεῖν, *to repent*, in the sense of those to whom Jesus is speaking), has nevertheless one decisive step more to take, in order that his salvation may be consummated, and that God may rejoice fully on his account; that is, to recognize his inward sin, to embrace the Saviour, and to be changed in heart. Till then his regulated walk within the bosom of the ancient covenant is only provisional, like the whole of that covenant itself. It may easily happen that, like the Pharisees, such a man should end by rejecting real salvation, and so perishing. How should

heaven rejoice over a state so imperfect, with a joy like that which is awakened among its inhabitants by the sight of a sinner really saved? It is evident that in this saying we must take the word *just* (as well as the word *repent*) in the sense given to it by the interlocutors of Jesus, that relative meaning which we have already found, vers. 31, 32: the just, Levitically and theocratically speaking. This righteousness is nothing; it is the directest way to conduct to true righteousness; but on condition that a man does not rest in it. It thus affords a certain occasion for joy in heaven—this is implied in the comparative, *joy more than . . .*—but less joy, however, than the salvation of a single soul fully realized. That is already evident from the contrast established by this verse between the joy of heaven and the discontent of the Pharisees on occasion of the same event (ver. 1). The *I say unto you* has here, as everywhere, a special solemnity. Jesus speaks of heavenly things as a witness (John 3 : 11) and as an interpreter of the thoughts of God. The words *in heaven* embrace God and the beings who surround Him, those who are represented in the parable by *the friends and neighbors*. The conjunction ἤ supposes a μᾶλλον which is not expressed. This form is explained by the blending of two ideas: "there is joy" (hence the absence of μᾶλλον), "there is *yet more than . . .*" (and hence the ἤ). This form delicately expresses the idea indicated above, that there is also a certain satisfaction in heaven on account of the righteousness of sincere Israelites. How can one help being struck with the manner in which Jesus, both in this parable and the two following, identifies His feelings and conduct absolutely with the feelings and the action of God Himself? The shepherd seeking, the woman finding, the father welcoming—is it not in His person that God accomplishes all those divine works?

This parable is placed by Matthew in the great discourse of chap. 18, and—Bleek cannot help acknowledging—because of an association of ideas belonging purely to the evangelist himself. Indeed, the application which he makes of the lost sheep to the *little ones* (vers. 1–6 and 10; ver 11 is an interpolation) is certainly not in keeping with the original sense of this parable. The original reference of this description to lost sinners, as Holtzmann says in the same connection, has been *preserved by Luke*. But how in this case are we to explain how Matthew has wrested the parable from its original meaning if he copied the same document as Luke (A, according to Holtzmann)? Besides, how comes it that Matthew omits the following parable, that of the drachma, which Luke, according to this critic, takes, as well as the preceding, from the common document?

Vers. 8–10.* *The Lost Drachma.* The anxiety of the woman to find her lost piece of money certainly does not proceed from a feeling of pity; it is *self-interest* which leads her to act. She had painfully earned it, and had kept it in reserve for some important purpose; it is a real loss to her. Here is divine love portrayed from an entirely different side. The sinner is not only, in the eyes of God, a suffering being, like the sheep on whom He takes pity; he is a precious being, created in His image, to whom He has assigned a part in the accomplishment of His plans. A lost man is a blank in His treasury. Is not this side of divine love, rightly understood, still more striking than the preceding?

The general features, as well as the minutest details, of the descriptions are fitted to bring into prominence this idea of the value which God attaches to a lost soul. General features: 1. The idea of *loss* (ver. 8*a*); 2. The *persevering care* which the woman

* Ver. 8. ℵ. B. L. X. 10 Mnn., εως ου instead of εως οτου. Ver. 9. 6 Mjj. 25 Mnn., συγκαλει instead of συγκαλειται.

expends in seeking the drachma (ver. 8*b*) ; 3. Her *overflowing joy* when she has found it (ver. 9). Details : The woman has laboriously earned this small sum, and saved it only at the cost of many privations, and for some urgent necessity. Jesus leaves out the ἐξ ὑμῶν, *of you*, of ver. 4. Perhaps there were none but men in the throng, or if otherwise, He was addressing them only. For the number 100, ver. 4, He substitutes the number 10 ; the loss of one in 10 is more serious than of one in 100. The drachma was worth about eight pence. It was the price of a full day's work. Comp. Matt. 20 : 2, where the master agrees with the laborers for *a penny* (a sum nearly equivalent to eight pence) a day, and Rev. 6 : 6. With what minute pains are the efforts of this woman described, and what a charming interior is the picture of her persevering search ! She lights her lamp ; for in the East the apartment has no other light than that which is admitted by the door ; she removes every article of furniture, and sweeps the most dusty corners. Such is the image of God coming down in the person of Jesus into the company of the lowest among sinners, following them to the very dens of the theocracy, with the light of divine truth. The figure of the sheep referred rather to the publicans ; and that of the drachma applies rather to the second class mentioned in ver. 1, the ἁμαρτωλοί, beings plunged in vice.

In depicting the joy of the woman (ver. 9), Luke substitutes the Middle συγκαλεῖται, *she calleth to herself*, for the Active συγκαλεῖ, *she calleth*, ver. 6 ; the Alex. have ill-advisedly obliterated this shade. It is not, as in the preceding parable, the object lost which profits by the finding ; it is the woman herself, who had lost something of her own ; and so she claims to be congratulated *for herself ;* hence the Middle. This shade of expression reflects the entire difference of meaning between the two parables. It is the same with another slight modification. Instead of the expression of ver. 6 : "For I have found my sheep *which was lost* (τὸ ἀπολωλός)," the woman says here : "the piece which *I had lost* (ἣν ἀπώλεσα)" ; the first phrase turned attention to the sheep and its distress ; the second attracts our interest to the woman, disconsolate about her loss. What grandeur belongs to the picture of this humble rejoicing which the poor woman celebrates with her neighbors, when it becomes the transparency through which we get a glimpse of God Himself, rejoicing with His elect and His angels over the salvation of a single sinner, even the chief ! The ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγ., *in the presence of the angels*, may be explained in two ways : either by giving to the word *joy* the meaning *subject of joy*—in that case, this saying refers directly to the joy of the angels themselves—or by referring the word χαρά to the joy *of God* which breaks forth *in presence* of the angels, and in which they participate. The first sense is the more natural.

But those two images, borrowed from the animal and inanimate world, remain too far beneath their object. They do not furnish Jesus with the means of displaying the full riches of feeling which filled the heart of God toward the sinner, nor of unveiling the sinner's inner history in the drama of conversion. For that, He needed an image borrowed from the domain of moral and sensitive nature, the sphere of human life. The word which sums up the first two parables is *grace ;* that which sums up the third is *faith.*

Vers. 11–32. *The Child lost and found.* This parable consists of two distinct descriptions, which form the counterpart of one another, that of the younger son (vers. 11–24), and that of the elder son (vers. 25–32). By the second, Jesus returns completely, as we shall see, to the historical situation described vers. 1, 2, and the scene is closed.

Vers. 11–24. *The younger Son.* This first part of the parable embraces four representations corresponding to the four phases of the converted sinner's life: 1*st.* Sin (vers. 11–13); 2*d.* Misery (vers. 14–16); 3*d.* Conversion (vers. 17–20*a*); 4*th.* Restoration (vers. 20*b*–24).

Vers. 11–13.* Jesus discontinues the interrogative form used in the two previous cases: we have no more an argument; we have a narrative, a real parable. The three persons composing the family represent God and His people. In accordance with vers. 1, 2, the elder son, the representative of the race, the prop of the *gens*, and as such more deeply attached than the younger to the land of his household hearth, personifies the Israelites who were Levitically irreproachable, and especially the Pharisees. The younger, in whose case the family bond is weaker, and whom this very circumstance renders more open to the temptation of breaking with it, represents those who have abandoned Jewish legalism, publicans and people of immoral lives. His demand for his goods is most probably to be explained by the fact that the elder received as his inheritance a double share of the patrimonial lands, the younger members a single share (see at 12 : 13). The latter then desired that his father, anticipating the division, should give him the equivalent of his portion in money, an arrangement in virtue of which the entire domain, on the father's death, would come to the elder. Two things impel him to act thus: the air of the paternal home oppresses him, he feels the constraint of his father's presence; then the world without attracts him, he hopes to enjoy himself. But to realize his wishes, he needs two things—freedom and money. Here is the image of a heart swayed by licentious appetites; God is the obstacle in its way, and freedom to do anything appears to it as the condition of happiness. Money ought not to be taken as a figure applied to the talents and graces which the sinner has received; it simply represents here the power of satisfying one's tastes. In the father's consenting to the guilty wish of his son, a very solemn thought is expressed, that of the sinner's abandonment to the desires of his own heart, the παραδιδόναι ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις (Rom. 1 : 24, 26, 28), the ceasing on the part of the Divine Spirit to strive against the inclinations of a spoiled heart, which can only be cured by the bitter experiences of sin. God gives such a man over to his folly. The use which the sinner makes of his sadly-acquired liberty is described in ver. 13. All those images of sin blended in many respects, so far as the sinners present were concerned, with actual facts. The *far country* to which the son flies is the emblem of the state of a soul which has so strayed that the thought of God no longer even occurs to it. The complete dissipation of his goods represents the carrying out of man's liberty to its furthest limits. Μακράν is not an adjective, but an adverb (ver. 20, 7 : 6, etc).

Vers. 14–16.† The liberty of self-enjoyment is not unlimited, as the sinner would fain think; it has limits of two kinds: the one pertaining to the individual himself, such as satiety, remorse, the feeling of destitution, and abjectness resulting from vice (*when he had spent all*); the other arising from certain unfavorable outward circumstances, here represented by the famine which occurs at this crisis, that is, domestic or public calamities which complete the subduing of the heart which has been already overwhelmed, and further, the absence of all divine consolation. Let those two causes of misery coincide, and wretchedness is at its height. Then happens what

* Ver. 12. ℵ^{c}. A. B. L., *ο δε* instead of *και*.

† Ver. 14. ℵ. A. B. D. L. 3 Mnn., *ισχυρα* instead of *ισχυρος*. Ver. 16. ℵ B. D. L. R. some Mnn. Syr^{cur}. It$^{aliq.}$, *χορτασθηναι εκ* instead of *γεμισαι την κοιλιαν αυτου απο*.

Jesus calls *ὑστερεῖσθαι, to be in want*, the absolute void of a heart which has sacrificed everything for pleasure, and which has nothing left but suffering. We can hardly avoid seeing, in the ignoble dependence into which this young Jew falls under a heathen master, an allusion to the position of the publicans who were engaged in the service of the Roman power. But the general idea which corresponds to this touch is that of the degrading dependence, in respect of the world, to which the vicious man always finds himself reduced in the end. He sought pleasure, he finds pain ; he wished freedom, he gets bondage. The word *ἐκολλήθη* has in it something abject ; the unhappy wretch is a sort of appendage to a strange personality. *To feed swine*, the last business for a Jew. *Κεράτιον* denotes a species of coarse bean, used in the East for fattening those animals. At ver. 16, the Alex. Mjj. are caught in the very act of purism ; men of delicate taste could not bear the gross expression, *to fill the belly with* . . . There was therefore substituted in the public reading the more genteel term, *to satisfy himself with* . . . ; and this correction has passed into the Alex. text. The act expressed by the received reading is that, not of relishing food, but merely of filling a void. The smallest details are to the life in this portraiture. During this time of famine, when the poor herdsman's allowance did not suffice to appease his hunger, he was reduced to covet the coarse bean with which the herd was carefully fattened, when he drove it home : the swine were in reality more precious than he. They sold high, an image of the contempt and neglect which the profligate experiences from that very world to which he has sacrificed the most sacred feelings.

Vers. 17–20*a*.* This representation, which depicts the conversion of the sinner, includes two things, repentance (ver. 17) and faith (vers. 18–20*a*). The words, *when he came to himself*, ver. 17, denote a solemn moment in human life, that in which the heart, after a long period of dissipation, for the first time becomes self-collected. The heart is God's sanctuary. To come to ourselves is therefore to find God. Repentance is a change of feeling ; we find it fully depicted in the regret which the sinner feels for that from which he has fled (the father's house), and in that horror which fills him at that which he sought so ardently (the strange land). As to the mercenaries whom he envies, might they not represent those heathen proselytes who had a place, although a very inferior one (the outer court), in the temple, and who might thus from afar take part in the worship ; advantages from which the publicans, so long as they kept to their profession, were debarred by the excommunication which fell on them. From this change of feeling there springs a resolution (ver. 18), which rests on a remnant of confidence in the goodness of his father ; this is the dawn of faith. Did we not recollect that we are yet in the parable, the meaning of the words *before thee* would appear to blend with that of the preceding, *against heaven*. But in the image adopted the two expressions have a distinct meaning. Heaven is the avenger of all holy feelings when outraged, and particularly of filial devotion when trampled under foot. The young man sinned before his father at the time when, the latter beholding him with grief, he defied his last look, and obstinately turned his back on him. The possibility of an immediate and entire restoration does not enter his mind. He is ready to take the position of a servant in the house where he lived as a son, but where he shall have at least wherewith to satisfy his hunger. Here is portrayed that publican (described in chap. 18) who stood afar off, and dared

* Ver. 17. ℵ. B. L. some Mnn., *εφη* instead of *ειπεν*. A. B. P., *περισσευονται* instead of *περισσευουσιν*. 6 Mjj. some Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique}, Vg. add *ωδε* to *λιμω*. Ver. 19. 16 Mjj. 40 Mnn. It^{plerique}, omit *και* before *ουκετι*.

not even raise his eyes to God. But the essential fact is, that the resolution once taken, he carries it out. Here is faith in its fulness, actually arising, going to God. Faith is not a thought or a desire ; it is an act which brings two living beings into personal contact. What an impression must have been produced on the publicans present by this faithful picture of their past and present experiences ! But how much deeper still the emotion which awaits them when they hear Jesus unveiling, in the sequel, the feelings and conduct of God Himself toward them !

Vers. 20b–24.* Free pardon, entire restoration, the joys of adoption—such are the contents of these verses. The heart of God overflows in the sayings of Jesus. Every word vibrates with emotion, at once the tenderest and the holiest. The father seems never to have given up waiting for his son ; perceiving him from afar, he runs to meet him. God discerns the faintest sigh after good which breaks forth in a wanderer's heart ; and from the moment this heart takes a step toward Him, He takes ten to meet it, striving to show it something of His love. This history was exemplified at the very moment as between the publicans present and God, who was drawing near to them in Jesus. There is a wide difference between the confession uttered by the prodigal son, ver. 21, and that which had been extracted from him by the extremity of his misery (vers. 18, 19). The latter was a cry of despair ; but now his distress is over. It is therefore the cry of repentant love. The terms are the same : *I have sinned ;* but how different is the accent. Luther felt it profoundly ; the discovery of the difference between the repentance of fear and that of love was the true principle of the Reformation. He cannot come to the end ; the very assurance of pardon prevents him from finishing and saying, *make me as . . .*, according to his first purpose. The Alex. have not understood this omission, and have mistakenly added here the last words of ver. 19.

Pardon involves restoration. No humbling novitiate ; no passing through inferior positions. The restoration is as complete as the repentance was sincere and the faith profound. In all those touches—the shoes, the robe, the signet ring (the mark of the free man, fitted to express an independent will)—a sound exegesis should limit itself to finding the expression of the fulness of restoration to the filial standing ; only homiletic application may allow itself to go further, though even it should beware of falling into a play of wit, as when Jerome and Olshausen see in the robe the righteousness of Christ, in the ring the seal of the Holy Spirit, in the shoes the power of walking in the ways of God. Others have found in the servants the image of the Holy Spirit or of pastors ! The Alex. reject *τήν* before *στολήν*, and that justly. There is a gradation : first *a robe*, in opposition to nakedness ; then, *and even the best*, because he who has descended lowest, if he rise again, should mount up highest. In the phrase, *the fatted calf*, ver. 23, the article should be observed. On every farm there is always *the* calf which is fattening for feast days. Jesus knows rural customs. Augustine and Jerome find in this calf an indication of the sacrifice of Christ ! According to the *tout ensemble* of the picture, which should be our standard in interpreting all the special details, this emblem represents all that is most excellent and sweet in the communications of divine grace. The absence of every feature fitted to

* Ver. 21. 7 Mjj. some Mnn. It. Vg. omit *και* before *ουκετι*. ℵ. B D. U. X. 20 Mnn. add, after *υιος σου*, *ποιησον με ως ενα των μισθιων σου*. Ver. 22. ℵ. B. L. X. It. Vg. add *ταχυ* (D., *ταχεως*) before *εξενεγκατε*. 7 Mjj. (Alex.) omit *την* before *στολην*. Ver. 23. ℵ. B. L. R. X. It. Vg., *φερετε* instead of *ενεγκαντες*. Ver. 24. 9 Mjj. 30 Mnn. It. Vg. omit *και* before *απολωλως ην*.

represent the sacrifice of Christ, is at once explained when we remember that we have here to do with a parable, and that expiation has no place in the relations between man and man. By the plural, *let us be merry*, the father himself takes his share in the feast (as in ver. 7). The two parallel clauses of ver. 24 recall the two aspects in which sin was presented in the two previous parables ; *he was dead* relates to the personal misery of the sinner (the lost sheep) ; *he was lost*, to the loss felt by God Himself (the lost drachma). The parable of the prodigal son combines those two points of view : the son was lost, and the father had lost something. With the words, *and they began to be merry*, the parable reaches the exact point at which things were at the moment when Christ uttered it (vers. 1 and 2).

Vers. 25–32. *The elder Son.* This part embraces : 1*st.* The interview of the elder son with the servant (vers. 25–28*a*) ; 2*d.* His interview with his father (vers. 28*b*–32). Jesus here shows the Pharisees their murmurings put in action, and constrains them to feel their gravity.

Vers. 25–28*a*.* While the house is filled with mirth, the elder son is at work. Here is the image of the Pharisee busied with his rites, while repentant sinners are rejoicing in the serene sunshine of grace. Every free and joyous impulse is abhorrent to the formal spirit of pharisaism. This repugnance is described in ver. 26. Rather than go straight into the house, the elder son begins by gathering information from a servant ; he does not feel himself *at home* in the house (John 8 : 35). The servant in his answer substitutes for the expressions of the father : *he was dead* . . ., *lost* . . ., these simple words : *he is come safe and sound.* This is the fact, without the father's moral appreciation, which it is not fitting in him to appropriate. Everything in the slightest details of the picture breathes the most exquisite delicacy. The refusal to enter corresponds to the discontent of the Pharisees, who do not understand being saved in common with the vicious.

Vers. 28*b*–32.† This interview contains the full revelation of pharisaic feeling, and brings into view the contrast between it and the fatherly heart of God. The procedure of the father, who steps out to his son and invites him to enter, is realized in the very conversation which Jesus, come from God, holds with them at the moment. The answer of the son (vers. 29 and 30) includes two accusations against his father : the one bears on his way of acting toward himself (ver. 29), the other on his conduct in respect of his other son (ver. 30). The contrast is meant to bring out the partiality of the father. The blind and innocent self-satisfaction which forms the heart of pharisaism could not be better depicted than in the words : " neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment ;" and the servile and mercenary position of the legal Jew in the theocracy, than thus : " Lo ! these many years *do I serve thee.*" Bengel makes the simple observation on these words : *servus erat.* What in reality was his father to him ? A master ! He even counts the years of his hard servitude : *There are so many years !* . . . Such is man's view of accomplishing good under the law : a labor painfully carried through, and which consequently merits payment. But by its very nature it is totally deprived of the delights which belong only to the

* Ver. 26. *Αυτου* after *παιδων*, in ς (not ς^{e}) is only supported by some Mnn.

† Ver. 28. The MSS. are divided between *ηθελεν* (T. R.) and *ηθελησεν*, and between *ο ουν* (T. R.) and *ο δε* (Alex.). Ver. 29. 7 Mjj. add *αυτου* to *τω πατρι*. Ver. 30. Instead of *τον μοσχον τον σιτευτον*, 6 Mjj , *τον σιτευτον μοσχον*. Ver. 32. Instead of *ανεζησεν* (T. R.), ℵ* B. L. R. Δ. Syr^{sch}, *εζησεν*. ℵ. B. X. several Mnn. It. omit *και*, and A. B. D. L. R. X. *ην*, before *απολωλως*.

sphere of free love; it has no other idea of them than that which it gets by seeing those joys of the reconciled sinner, by which it is scandalized. The joy which is wanting to it is this *kid to make merry with its friends*, which has never been granted to it.

With the hard and ill-paid labor of legal obedience he contrasts (ver. 30) the life of his brother, merry in sin, happier still, if possible, in the hour of his return and pardon. The meaning is, that in the eyes of pharisaism, as virtue is a task, sin is a pleasure; and hence there ought to be a payment for the first, an equivalent of pain for the second. The father, by refusing to the one his just reward, by adding in the case of the other joy to joy, the enjoyments of the paternal home to those of debauchery, has shown his preference for the sinner and his sympathy with sin. *Thy son*, says the elder son, instead of: *my brother*. He would express at once the partiality of his father and his own dislike to the sinner. Do not those sayings which Jesus puts into the mouth of the righteous legalist, contain the keenest criticism of a state of soul wherein men discharge duty all the while abhorring it, and wherein while avoiding sin, they thirst after it? The particular *μετὰ πορνῶν* is a stroke of the pencil added to the picture of ver. 13 by the charitable hand of the elder brother.

The father's answer meets perfectly the two accusations of his son. Ver. 31 replies to ver. 29; ver. 32 to ver. 30. The father first clears himself from the charge of injustice to the son who is speaking to him; and with what condescension! "My child (*τέκνον*)." This form of address has in it something more loving even than *υἱέ, son*. Then he reminds him that his life with him might have been a feast all along. There was no occasion, therefore, to make a special feast for him. And what good would a particular gift serve, when everything in the house was continually at his disposal. The meaning of this remarkable saying is, that nothing prevented the believing Israelite from already enjoying the sweets of divine communion—a fact proved by the Psalms; comp. *e.g.* Ps. 23 and 63. St. Paul himself, who ordinarily presents the law as the instrument of condemnation, nevertheless derives the formula of grace from a saying of Moses (Rom. 10: 6–8), proving that in his eyes grace is already in the law, through the pardon which accompanies sacrifice and the Holy Spirit granted to him who asks Him (Ps. 51: 9–14); and that when he speaks of the law as he ordinarily does, it is after the manner of his adversaries, isolating the commandment from grace. In the same way as ver. 31 presents theocratic fidelity as a happiness, and not a task, so ver. 32 reveals sin as a misery, and not as an advantage. There was therefore ground for celebrating a feast on the return of one who had just escaped from so great a misery, and by his arrival had restored the life of the family in its completeness. *Thy brother*, says the father; it is the answer to the *thy son* of ver. 30. He reminds him of the claims of fraternal love. Here Jesus stops; He does not say what part the elder son took. It lay with the Pharisees themselves, by the conduct which they would adopt, to decide this question and finish the narrative.

The Tübingen school (Zeller, Volkmar, Hilgenfeld, not Köstlin) agree in regarding the elder son, not as the pharisaic party, but as the Jewish people in general; the younger son, not as the publicans, but Gentile nations. "The elder son is unmistakably the image of Judaism, which deems that it possesses special merit because of its fidelity to the one true God. The younger son . . . is the not less easily recognized portrait of Gentile humanity given up to polytheism and immorality. The discontent of the first, on seeing the reception granted to his brother, represents the jealousy of the Jews on account of the entrance of the Gentiles into the Church" (Hilgenfeld, "die Evangel.," p. 198). It would follow, then: 1. That this parable

had been invented and put into the mouth of Jesus by Luke, with the view of supporting the system of his master Paul ; 2. That to this invention he had added a second, intended to accredit the former, that of the historical situation described vers. 1 and 2. But, 1. Is it conceivable that the evangelist, who marked out his own programme for himself, 1 : 1–4, should take the liberty of treating his materials in so free and easy a style 2. Have we not found in this description a multitude of delicate allusions to the historical surroundings amid which the parable is reputed to have been uttered, and which would not be applicable in the sense proposed (vers. 15, 17, etc.)? 3. How from this parable St. Paul might have extracted the doctrine of justification by faith, is easy to understand. But that this order was inverted, that the parable was invented as an after-thought to give a body to the Pauline doctrine, is incompatible with the absence of every dogmatic element in the exposition. Would not the names of repentance, faith, justification, and the idea of expiation, have been infallibly introduced, if it had been the result of a dogmatic study contemporary with the ministry of Paul? 4. We have seen that the description finds its perfect explanation, that there remains not a single obscure point in the light in which it is placed by Luke. It is therefore arbitrary to seek another setting for it. The prejudice which has led the Tübingen school to this contra-textual interpretation is evident. Keim, while discovering, like this school, Paulinism as the basis of the parable (p. 80), thinks that here we have one of the passages wherein the author, with the view of conciliating, more or less abjures his master, St. Paul. The evangelist dares not wholly disapprove the Judeo-Christianity which holds by the commandments ; he praises it even (ver. 31). He only demands that it shall authorize the entrance of the Gentiles into the Church ; and on this condition he lets its legal spirit pass. We should thus have simply the juxtaposition of the two principles which conflicted with one another in the apostolic churches. But, 1. In this attempt at conciliation, the elder son would be completely sacrificed to the younger ; for the latter is seated at table in the house, the former is without, and we remain in ignorance as to whether he will re-enter. And this last would represent the apostolic Christianity which founded the Church ! 2. Adopting biblical premises, ver. 31 can easily be applied to the Mosaic system faithfully observed, and that, as we have seen, according to the view of St. Paul himself. 3. It belonged to the method of progressive transition, which Jesus always observed, to seek to develope within the bosom of the Mosaic dispensation, and without ever attacking it, the new principle which was to succeed it, and the germ of which was already deposited in it. Jesus did not wish to suppress anything which He had not completely replaced and surpassed. He therefore accepted the ancient system, while attaching to it the new. The facts pointed out by Keim are fully explained by this situation.

Holtzmann thinks that our parable, which is not found in Matthew, may really be only an amplification of that of the two sons, which is found in that evangelist (Matt. 21 : 28–30). Does not this supposition do too much honor to the alleged amplifier, whether Luke or any other ?

6. *The Two Parables on the use of Earthly Goods :* chap. 16. Those two remarkable passages are peculiar to Luke, though taken, according to Holtzmann, from the common source A, from which Matthew also borrows. For what reason, on this hypothesis, has the latter omitted them ? The second especially (ver. 31 : *They have Moses and the prophets*) was perfectly in keeping with the spirit of this Gospel. According to Weizsäcker, the two parables have undergone very grave modifications in the course of successive editions In his view, the original thought of the parable of the unjust steward was this : Beneficence, the means of justification for injustices committed by him who shows it. In our Gospel, it is intended to promise to the Gentiles an entrance into the kingdom of God, as a recompense for their benefits toward the lawful heirs of the kingdom. The second parable would also belong in origin to the tendency of Ebionite Judeo-Christianity ; it would transform into a description the idea of the four beatitudes and four maledictions, which in Luke open the Sermon on the Mount. Later, it became the representation of the rejection of the unbeliev

ing Jews (the wicked rich man and his brethren), and of the salvation of the Gentiles represented by Lazarus (probably a Gentile, according to ver. 21). We shall see if the interpretation justifies suppositions so violent.

This piece contains : 1*st.* The parable of the unjust steward, with accompanying reflections (vers. 1–13) ; 2*d.* Reflections forming an introduction to the parable of the wicked rich man, and the parable itself (vers. 14–31). Those two portraits are evidently the counterparts of one another. The idea common to both is that of the relation between the use made of earthly goods and man's future beyond the tomb. The steward represents the owner who is able to secure his future by a wise use of those transitory goods ; the wicked rich man, the owner who compromises his future by neglecting this just employment of them.

1*st.* Vers. 1 13. *The Unjust Steward.* Is there a connection between this lesson on riches and the preceding? The formula ἔλεγε δὲ καί, *and He said also* (ver. 1), seems to indicate that there is. Olshausen supposes that *the disciples* (ver. 1) to whom the parable is addressed are publicans brought back to God, those recent converts of chap. 15, whom Jesus was exhorting to employ wisely the earthly goods which they had acquired unjustly. But the expression : *to His disciples* (ver. 1), refers naturally to the ordinary disciples of our Lord. In the sense of Olshausen, some epithet would require to have been added. The connection is rather in the keeping up of the contrast between the life of faith and pharisaic righteousness. The two chief sins of the Pharisees were pride, with its fruit hypocrisy, and avarice (ver. 14). We see in the Sermon on the Mount, which was directed against their false righteousness, how Jesus passes directly from the one of those sins to the other (Matt. 6 : 18, 19). This is precisely what He does here. He had just been stigmatizing pharisaic pride in the person of the elder son. Now this disposition is ordinarily accompanied by that proud hardness which characterizes the wicked rich man, as the heart broken by the experiences of faith is naturally disposed to the liberal actions of the unjust steward. Hence the form : *He said to them also.*

And first the parable : vers. 1–9.* In this portraiture, as in some others, Jesus does not scruple to use the example of the wicked for the purpose of stimulating His disciples. And in fact, in the midst of conduct morally blamable, the wicked often display remarkable qualities of activity, prudence, and perseverance, which may serve to humble and encourage believers. The parable of the unjust steward is the masterpiece of this sort of teaching.

The rich man of ver. 1 is a great lord living in the capital, far from his lands, the administration of which he has committed to a factor. The latter is not a mere slave, as in 12 : 42 ; he is a freeman, and even occupying a somewhat high social position (ver. 3). He enjoys very large powers. He gathers in and sells the produce at his pleasure. Living himself on the revenue of the domain, it is his duty to transmit to his master the surplus of the income. Olshausen alleges that this master, in the view of Jesus, represents the prince of this world, the devil, and that only thus can the eulogium be explained which he passes (ver. 8) on the conduct of his knavish servant. This explanation is incompatible with the deprivation of the steward pronounced by

* Ver. 1. ℵ. B. D. L. R. omit αυτου after μαθητας. Ver. 2. 7 Mjj. omit σου after οικονομιας. ℵ. B. D. P., δυνη instead of δυνηση. Ver. 4. ℵ. B. D. some Mnn. Syr. add εκ, and L. X. It$^{\text{plerique}}$, Vg., απο before της. Vers. 6, 7. ℵ. B. D. L., τα γραμματα instead of το γραμμα. Ver. 9. 8 Mjj. some Mnn. Syr$^{\text{sch}}$. It$^{\text{aliq.}}$, εκλιπη or εκλειπη instead of εκλιπητε, which the T. R. reads with ℵ$^{\text{ca}}$ F. P. U.

the master, ver. 2, and which, in the view of our Lord, can only denote death. It is not Satan who disposes of human life. Satan is not even the master of riches ; does not God say, Hag. 2 : 8 : "The silver is mine, and the gold is mine?" Comp. Ps. 24 : 1. Finally, it is not to Satan, certainly, that we shall have to give account of our administration of earthly goods ! Our Lord clearly gives out Himself as the person represented by the master, vers. 8 and 9 : *The Master commended . . .; and I also say unto you.* Again, could we admit that in ver. 12 the expression : *faithful in that which is another man's* (your master's), should signify : "faithful to that which the devil has committed to you of his goods?" Meyer had modified this explanation of Olshausen : the master, according to him, is wealth personified, mammon. But how are we to attribute the personal part which the master in the parable plays to this abstract being, wealth? The master can only represent God Himself, Him *who maketh poor and maketh rich, who bringeth low and lifteth up.* In relation to his neighbor, every man may be regarded as the proprietor of his goods ; but in relation to God, no one is more than a tenant. This great and simple thought, by destroying the right of property relatively to God, gives it its true basis in the relation between man and man. Every man should respect the property of his neighbor, just *because* it is not the latter's property, but that of God, who has entrusted it to him. In the report made to the master about the delinquencies of his steward, we are to see the image of that perfect knowledge which God has of all human unfaithfulness. To waste the goods of God, means, after having taken out of our revenue what is demanded for our maintenance, instead of consecrating the remainder to the service of God and of His cause, squandering it on our pleasure, or hoarding it up for ourselves. Here we have the judgment of Jesus on that manner of acting which appears to us so natural : it is to forget that we are but stewards, and to act as proprietors.

The saying of the master to the steward (ver. 2) does not include a call to clear himself ; it is a sentence of deprivation. His guilt seems thoroughly established. The account which he is summoned to render is the inventory of the property confided to him, to be transmitted to his successor. What corresponds to this deprivation is evidently the event by which God takes away from us the free disposal of the goods which He had entrusted to us here below, that is, death. The sentence of deprivation pronounced beforehand denotes the awakening of the human conscience when it is penetrated by this voice of God : "Thou must die ; thou shalt give account." Φωνήσας is stronger than καλέσας : "speaking with the tone of a master." In the phrase τί τοῦτο, τί may be taken as an exclamation : "How happens it that I hear this !" or interrogatively, with τοῦτο in apposition : 'What do I hear of thee, to wit this?" The accusation which we should expect to follow is understood. The present δύνῃ, in some Alex., is that of the immediate future.

The words : *he said within himself*, have some relation to those of 15 : 17 : *when he came to himself.* It is an act of recollection after a life passed in insensibility. The situation of the man is critical. Of the two courses which present themselves to his mind, the first, digging, and the second, begging, are equally intolerable to him, the one physically, the other morally. All at once, after long reflection, he exclaims, as if striking his forehead : I have it ! Ἔγνων, *I have come to see* (ver. 4). He starts from the sentence as from a fact which is irrevocable : *when I am put out.* But has he not those goods, which he is soon to hand over to another, in his hands for some time yet? May he not hasten to use them in such a way that he shall get advantage from them when he shall have them no more, by making sure, for example, of a refuge

for the time when he shall be houseless? When man thinks seriously of his approaching death, it is impossible for him not to be alarmed at that deprivation which awaits him, and at the state of nakedness which will follow. Happy if in that hour he can take a firm resolution. For some time yet he has in his hands the goods of his divine Master, which death is about to wrest from him. Will it not be wisdom on his part so to use them during the brief moments when he has them yet at his disposal, that they shall bear interest for him when they shall be his no more?

This steward, who will soon be homeless, knows people who have houses: "Let us then make friends of them; and when I shall be turned to the street, more than one house shall be open to receive me." The debtors, whom he calls to him with this view, are merchants who are in the habit of coming to get their supplies from him, getting credit probably till they have made their own sales, and making their payments afterward. The Heb. βάτος, the *bath*, contains about sixty pints. The gift of fifty of those *baths* might mount up to the sum of some thousands of francs. The κόρος, *corus* (homer), contains ten *ephahs;* and the value of twenty *homers* might rise to some hundreds of francs. The difference which the steward makes between the two gifts is remarkable; it contains a proof of discernment. He knows his men as the saying is, and can calculate the degree of liberality which he must show to each to gain a like result, that is to say, the hospitality he expects to receive from them until it be repaid. Jesus here describes alms in the most piquant form. Does a rich man, for example, tear up the bill of one of his poor debtors? He only does what the steward does here. For if all we have is God's, supposing we lend anything, it it out of *His* property that we have taken it; and if we give it away, it is with *His* goods (*that which is another's*, ver. 12) that we are generous in so acting. Beneficence from this point of view appears as a sort of holy unfaithfulness. By means of it we prudently make for ourselves, like the steward, personal friends, while we use wealth which, strictly speaking, is that of our Master. But differently from the steward, we do so *holily*, because we know that we are not acting without the knowledge and contrary to the will of the divine Owner, but that, on the other hand, we are entering into His purposes of love, and that He rejoices to see us thus using the goods which He has committed to us with that intention. This unfaithfulness is faithfulness (ver. 12).

The commendation which the master gives the steward (ver. 8) is not absolute. It has a twofold limitation, first in the word τῆς ἀδικίας, "the unjust steward," an epithet which he must certainly put in the master's mouth, and then in the explanatory phrase: "because he had done wisely." The meaning of the commendation, then, is to this effect: "Undoubtedly a clever man! It is only to be regretted that he has not shown as much probity as prudence." Thus, even though beneficence chiefly profits him who exercises it, God rejoices to see this virtue. And while He has no favor for the miser who hoards His goods, or for the egoist who squanders them, He approves the man who disposes of them wisely in view of his eternal future. Weizsäcker holds that the eulogium given by the master should be rejected from the parable. Had he understood it better, he would not have proposed this suppression, which would be a mutilation.

It is with the second part of ver. 8 that the application begins. "*Wisely:* Yes, adds Jesus, it is quite true. For there is more wisdom found among the children of this world in their mode of acting toward the children of the generation to which they belong, than among the children of light in their conduct toward those who

belong to theirs." *Αἰῶν οὗτος, this age* (world); the period of history anterior to the coming of the kingdom of God. *Φῶς*: the domain of the higher life into which Jesus introduces His disciples, and in which the brightness of divine wisdom reigns. Both spheres have their own population, and every inhabitant of the one or the other is surrounded by a certain number of contemporaries like himself, who form his *γενεά* or generation. Those belonging to the first sphere use every means for their own interest, to strengthen the bonds which unite them to their contemporaries of the same stamp. But those of the second neglect this natural measure of prudence. They forget to use God's goods to form bonds of love to the contemporaries who share their character, and who might one day give them a full recompense, when they themselves shall want everything and these shall have abundance. Ver. 9 finishes the application. The words: *and I also say unto you*, correspond to these: *and the Lord commended* (ver. 8). As in chap. 15 Jesus had identified Himself with the Father who dwells in heaven, so in this saying He identifies Himself with the invisible owner of all things: *and I*. Jesus means: Instead of hoarding up or enjoying—a course which will profit you nothing when, on the other side of the tomb, you will find yourselves in your turn poor and destitute of everything—hasten to make for yourselves, with the goods of another (God's), personal friends (*ἑαυτοῖς, to yourselves*), who shall then be bound to you by gratitude, and share with you their well-being. By a course of beneficence make haste to transform into a bond of love the base metal of which death will soon deprive you. What the steward did in his sphere in relation to people of his own quality, see that you do in yours toward those who belong like you to the world to come. The Alex. reading *ἐκλίπῃ* (*μαμωνᾶς*), would signify: "that when money shall fail you (by the event of death)." The T. R.: *ἐκλίπητε, when ye shall fail*, refers to the cessation of life, embracing privation of everything of which it is made up.

The friends, according to Meyer and Ewald, are the angels, who, affected by the alms of the beneficent man, are attached to him, and assist him at the time of his passing into eternity. But according to the parable, the friends can only be men who have been succored by him on the earth, poor here below, but possessing a share in the everlasting inheritance. What service can they render to the dying disciple? Here is perhaps the most difficult question in the explanation of the parable. Love testified and experienced establishes between beings a strict moral unity. This is clearly seen in the relation between Jesus and men. May not the disciple who reaches heaven without having gained here below the degree of development which is the condition of full communion with God, receive the increase of spiritual life, which is yet wanting to him, by means of these grateful spirits with whom he shared his temporal goods here below? (Comp. Rom. 15 : 27 and 1 Cor. 9 : 11.) Do we not already see on the earth the poor Christian, who is assisted by a humane, but in a religious point of view defective, rich man, by his prayers, by the overflowing of his gratitude, and the edification which he affords him, requiting his benefactor infinitely more and better than he receives from him? Almsgiving is thus found to be the most prudent investment; for the communication of love once established by its means, enables him who practises it to enjoy provisionally the benefits of a spiritual state far superior to that which he has himself reached. A similar thought is found in 14 : 13, 14. But if this explanation seems to leave something to desire, we must fall back on sayings such as these: "He that hath pity upon the poor, lendeth unto the Lord." "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have

done it unto me." It is Jesus, it is God Himself, who become our debtors by the assistance which we grant to those who are the objects of their love. And would such friends be useless in the hour of our dissolution? To receive is not to introduce. On the contrary, the first of these two terms assumes that admission is already adjudged. Faith, which alone opens heaven, is supposed in the hearers whom Jesus is addressing in the parable: they are disciples, ver. 1. Conversion, the fruit of faith, is equally implied, vers. 3 and 4. And since the disciple whom Jesus describes has chosen believers as the special objects of his liberality, he must to a certain degree be a believer himself.

The poetical expression *eternal habitations* (tents) is borrowed from patriarchal history. The tents of Abraham and Isaac under the oaks of Mamre are transferred in thought to the life to come, which is represented under the image of a glorified Canaan. What is the future of poetry but the past idealized? It is less natural to think, with Meyer, of the tents of Israel in the desert. We may here compare the πολλαὶ μοναί, the *many mansions*, in the Father's house, John 14:3. There remains to be explained the phrase ὁ μαμωνᾶς τῆς ἀδικίας, *the mammon of unrighteousness*. The word μαμωνᾶς is not, as has often been said, the name of an oriental divinity, the god of money. It denotes, in Syriac and Phœnician, money itself (see Bleek on Matt. 6. 24). The Aramaic name is ממון, and, with the article, ממונא. The epithet *unrighteous* is taken by many commentators simply to mean, that the acquisition of fortune is most frequently tainted with sin; according to Bleek and others, that sin readily attaches to the administration of it. But these are only accidental circumstances; the context points to a more satisfactory explanation. The ear of Jesus must have been constantly offended with that sort of reckless language in which men indulge without scruple: *my* fortune, *my* lands, *my* house. He who felt to the quick man's dependence on God, saw that there was a usurpation in this idea of ownership, a forgetfulness of the true proprietor; on hearing such language, He seemed to see the farmer playing the landlord. It is this sin, of which the natural man is profoundly unconscious, which He lays bare in this whole parable, and which He specially designates by this expression the unrighteous Mammon. The two, τῆς ἀδικίας, vers. 8 and 9, correspond exactly, and mutually explain one another. It is therefore false to see in this epithet, with De Wette, the Tübingen School, Rénan, etc., a condemnation of property as such. Man's sin does not consist in being, as one invested with earthly property, the steward of God, but in forgetting that he is so (parable following).

There is no thought more fitted than that of this parable, on the one hand, to undermine the idea of merit belonging to almsgiving (what merit could be got out of that which is another's?), and on the other, to encourage us in the practice of that virtue which assures us of friends and protectors for the grave moment of our passing into the world to come. What on the part of the steward was only wise unfaithfulness, becomes wise faithfulness in the servant of Jesus who acts on acquaintance with principle. It dare not be said that Jesus had wit; but if one could be tempted to use the expression at all, it would be here.

Of the many explanations of this parable which have been proposed, we shall merely quote some of the most prominent. Schleiermacher takes the master to be the Roman knights who farmed the taxes of Judæa, and sublet them to needy publicans; the steward, to be the publicans whom Jesus exhorted to expend on their countrymen the goods of which they cleverly cheated those great foreigners. Henri

Bauer sees in the master the Israelitish authorities, and in the unfaithful steward the Judeo-Christians, who, without troubling themselves about theocratic prejudices, should strive to communicate to the Gentiles the benefits of the covenant. According to Weizsäcker in the original thought of the parable the steward represented a Roman magistrate, who, to the detriment of the Jews, had been guilty of maladministration, but who thereafter strives to make amends by showing them gentleness and liberality. No wonder that from this point of view the critic knows not what to make of the eulogium passed by the master on his steward! But according to him, the sense and the image were transformed, and the description became in the hands of Luke an encouragement to rich and unbelieving Jews to merit heaven by doing good to poor Christians. The arbitrary and forced character of those explanations is clear as the day, and they need no detailed refutation. We are happy that we can agree, at least for once, with Hilgenfeld, both in the general interpretation of the parable and in the explanation of the sayings which follow ("Die Evangel," p. 199).

Vers 10–13.* "He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much; and he that is unjust in the least, is unjust also in much. 11. If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust that which is true? 12. And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own? 13. No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Many regard these reflections as arbitrarily placed here by Luke. But whatever Bleek may say, is it not just the manner in which we constitute ourselves proprietors of our earthly goods, which leads us to make a use of them which is contrary to their true destination? The following piece, therefore, derives its explanation from the parable, and is directly connected with it. Ver. 12 (τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ) would even be unintelligible apart from it. Ver. 10 is a comparison borrowed from common life. From the experience expressed in the two parallel propositions of this verse, it follows that a master does not think of elevating to a higher position the servant who has abused his confidence in matters of less importance. Faithful toward the master, unjust toward men.

The application of this rule of conduct to believers, vers. 11, 12. The *unrighteous mammon* is *God's* money, which man unjustly takes as *his own*. Faithfulness would have implied, above all, the employment of those goods in the service of God; but our deprivation once pronounced (death), it implies their employment in our interest rightly understood by means of beneficence. Through lack of this fidelity or wisdom, we establish our own incapacity to administer better goods if they were confided to us; therefore God will not commit them to us. Those goods are called τὸ ἀληθινόν, the *true* good, that which corresponds really to the idea of good. The contrast has misled several commentators to give to the word ἄδικος the meaning of *deceitful*. This is to confound the word ἀληθινός with ἀληθής (*veracious*). The real good is that which can in no case be changed to its opposite. It is not so with money, which is at best a provisional good, and may even be a source of evil. This is the application of 10*a*; ver. 12 is that of 10*b*. Earthly goods are called another's *good*, that is to say, a good which strictly belongs to another than ourselves (God). As it is *faithfulness* to God, so it is *justice* to man, to dispose of them with a view to our poor neighbor. *That which is our own* denotes the good for which we are essentially fitted, which is

* Ver. 12. B. L., το ημετερον instead of το υμετερον.

the normal completion of our being, the Divine Spirit become our own spirit by entire assimilation, or in the words of Jesus, *the kingdom prepared for us from the foundation of the world.* Our Lord's thought is therefore this : God commits to man, during his earthly sojourn in the state of probation, goods belonging to Him, which are of less value (earthly things) ; and the use, faithful or unfaithful, just or unjust, which we make of these settles the question whether our true patrimony (the goods of the Spirit, of which the believer himself receives only the earnest here below) shall or shall not be granted to him above. Like a rich father, who should trust his son with a domain of little value, that he might be trained later in life to manage the whole of his inheritance, thus putting his character to the proof, so God exposes external seeming goods of no value to the thousand abuses of our unskilful administration here below, that from the use which we make of them there may one day be determined for each of us whether we shall be put in possession, or whether we shall be deprived of our true eternal heritage—the good which corresponds to our inmost nature. The entire philosophy of our terrestrial existence is contained in these words.

Ver. 13, which closes this piece, is still connected with the image of the parable ; the steward had *two masters*, whose service he could not succeed in reconciling, the owner of the revenue which he was managing, and money, which he was worshipping. The two parallel propositions of this verse are usually regarded as identical in meaning and as differing only in the position assigned to each of the two masters successively as the objects of the two opposite feelings. But Bleek justly observes, that the absence of the article before ἑνος in the second proposition seems to forbid our taking this pronoun as the simple repetition of the preceding τὸν ἕνα in the first ; he therefore gives it a more general sense, *the one or the other* of the two preceding, and places the whole difference between the two parallel propositions in the graduated meaning of the different verbs employed, *holding to* being less strong than *loving*, and *despising* less strong than *hating*. Thus : " He will hate the one and love the other ; or at least, he will hold more either to the one or other of the two, which will necessarily lead him to neglect the service of the other." It makes no material difference. This verse, whatever the same learned critic may say, concludes this discourse perfectly, and forms the transition to the following piece, in which we find a sincere worshipper of Jehovah perishing because he has practically made money his God. The place which this verse occupies in Matthew in the Sermon on the Mount (6 : 24) is also suitable, but somewhat uncertain, like that of the whole piece of which it forms part.

2*d.* Vers. 14–31. *The Wicked Rich Man. The introduction* (vers. 14–18) is composed of a series of sayings which at first sight appear to have no connection with one another. Holtzmann thinks that Luke collects here at random sayings scattered throughout the *Logia*, for which till now he had not found any place. But there are only two leading ideas in this introduction ; the rejection of the Pharisees, and the permanence of the law. Now these are precisely the two ideas which are exhibited in action in the following parable ; the one in the condemnation of the wicked rich man, that faithful Pharisee (" father Abraham," vers. 24, 27, 30) ; the other in the manner in which Abraham asserts, even in Hades, the imperishable value of the law and the prophets. The relation between these two essential ideas of the introduction and of the parable is this ; the law on which the Pharisees staked their credit will nevertheless be the instrument of their eternal condemnation This is exactly what Jesus says to the Jews, John 5 : 45 : " There is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye

trust." It must be confessed, however, that this introduction, vers. 14–18, has a very fragmentary character. It contains the elements of a discourse, rather than the discourse itself. But this very fact proves that St. Luke has not taken the liberty of composing this introduction arbitrarily and independently of his sources. What historian would compose in such a manner? A discourse invented by the evangelist would not have failed to present an evident logical connection, as much as the discourses which Livy or Xenophon put into the mouth of their heroes. The very brokenness suffices to prove that the discourse was really held, and existed previously to this narrative.

Vers. 14 and 15.* "The Pharisees also, who were covetous, heard all these things; and they derided Him. 15. And He said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God." The last words of Jesus on the impossibility of combining the service of God and mammon, fell full on the heads of the Pharisees, those pretended servants of Jehovah, who nevertheless in their lives showed themselves such zealous worshippers of riches (Matt. 6, transition between vers. 18, 19). Hence their sneers (ἐκμυκτηρίζειν). The poverty of Jesus Himself was perhaps the theme of their derision: "It is easy to speak of money with such disdain . . . when one is destitute as thou art." In His answer (ver. 15), Jesus gives them to understand that the judgment of God is regulated by another standard than that of the men who are at their side. It is at the heart that God looks; and the reign of a single passion, such as that avarice which devours them, suffices to render odious in His eyes that whole righteousness of outward observances which gains for them the favor of the world. The phrase: *Ye are they which justify yourselves*, signifies, "your business is to pass yourselves off as righteous." The ὅτι, *for*, is explained by the idea of condemnation, which here attaches to that of *knowledge*: "God knows you [and rejects you], for . . ." Ἐν ἀνθρώποις, *on the part of men*, may mean: *among* men, or *in the judgment of* men. In connection with the idea of being highly esteemed, those two ideas are combined. Jesus means: "What men extol and glorify, consequently the ambitious, who, like you, by one means or another push themselves into the front rank, become an object of abomination to God." For all glorification of man rests on falsehood. God alone is great and deserving to be praised.

What had chiefly irritated the Pharisees in the preceding was the spiritual sense in which Jesus understood the law, unveiling under their airs of sanctity the stain of shameful avarice which defiled them. This idea affords the point of connection for what follows (vers. 16–18).

Vers. 16–18.† "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it. 17. But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one tittle of the law to fail. 18. Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery." But, adds Jesus (ver. 16), a new era is beginning, and with it your usurped dominion comes to an end. Since the time of John, that law and those prophets which you have made

* Ver. 14. ℵ. B. D. L. R. 3 Mnn. Syr^{sch}. It. omit και before οι Φαρισαιοι. Ver. 15. 11 Mjj. 70 Mnn. omit εστιν after Θεου.

† Ver. 16. ℵ. B. L. R. X. some Mnn. μεχρι instead of εως before Ιωαννου Ver. 18. B. D. L. some Mnn. It. Vg. omit πας between και and ο.

your pedestal in Israel are replaced by a new dispensation. To the religious aristocracy which you had succeeded in founding there follows a kingdom of God equally open to *every man* (πᾶς); all have access to it as well as you! *Βιάζεσθαι* should not be taken in the passive sense, as Hilgenfeld would have it: "Every man is constrained by the gospel," but as a middle, in the sense of *to hasten*, to throw themselves. There is, as it were, a dense crowd pressing through the gate which is now open, and every one, even the lowest of the publicans, is free to enter. Recall here the parables of chap. 15. But while this repentant crowd penetrates into the kingdom (7 : 29), the Pharisees and scribes remain without, like the elder son in the preceding parable. Let them beware, however! That legal system on which they have founded their throne in Israel is about to crumble to pieces (ver. 16); while the law itself, which they violate at the very moment they make it their boast, shall remain as the eternal expression of divine holiness and as the dreadful standard by which they shall be judged (ver. 17). The δέ is adversative: *but*. It indicates the contrast between the end of the legal economy and the permanence of the law. This contrast reminds us of the antitheses of Matt. 5 of which this saying is a sort of summary: "Ye have heard that it was said . . .; but I say unto you . . ." Jesus only abolishes the law by fulfilling it and confirming it spiritually. *Κεραία*, diminutive of *κέρας*, *horn*, denotes the small lines or hooks of the Hebrew letters. The least element of divine holiness which the law contains has more reality and durability than the whole visible universe.

The two verses, 16 and 17, are put by Matthew in the discourse of Jesus regarding John the Baptist, 11 : 12, 13, inversely in point of order. We can easily understand how the mention of John the Baptist, ver. 16, led Matthew to insert this saying in the discourse which Jesus pronounced on His forerunner. We have seen that in that same discourse, as given by Luke (chap. 7), this declaration was with great advantage replaced by a somewhat different saying, vers. 29, 30; and if, as Bleek owns (i. p. 454, *et seq.*), Luke decidedly deserves the preference as to the tenor of the words, it will doubtless be the same as to the place which he assigns them; for it is in general on this second point that his superiority appears.

Ver. 18. Not only in spite of the abolition of the legal form will the law continue in its substance; but if this substance even comes to be modified in the new economy, it will be in the direction of still greater severity. Jesus gives as an example the law of divorce. This same idea meets us, Matt. : 31, 32; it tallies fully with the meaning of the declaration, Matt. 19 : 3, *et seq.*, Mark 10 : 2, *et seq.*, which was uttered in this same journey, and almost at the same period. Jesus explains to the same class of hearers as in our passage, to the Pharisees namely, that if Moses authorized divorce, merely confining himself to guard it by some restrictions, there was a forsaking for a time of the true moral point of view already proclaimed Gen. 2, and which He, Jesus, came to re-establish in its purity. Luke and Matthew do not speak of the case of voluntary separation on the part of the *woman* referred to by Mark (10 : 12) and Paul (1 Cor. 7 : 10, 11). And Paul does not expressly interdict the divorced *man*, as Mark does, from contracting a second marriage. Those shades in such a precept cannot be voluntary; they represent natural variations due to tradition (Syn.) or to the nature of the context (Paul). The parallels quoted leave no doubt as to the real connection of ver. 18 with ver. 17. The *asyndeton* between those two verses is explained by the fragmentary character of Luke's report. What remains to us of this discourse resembles the peaks of a mountain chain, the base of

which is concealed from view, and must be reconstructed by reflection. As to the compiler, he has evidently refrained from filling up at his own hand the blanks in his document. The disjointed character of this account has been turned into an accusation against him ; but it ought rather to be regarded as a proof of his conscientious fidelity.

Does the context, as we have just established it, leave anything to be desired? Has Holtzmann ground for regarding this piece as a collection of sentences thrown together at random? Or is it necessary, in order to justify ver. 18, to regard it, with Schleiermacher, as an allusion to the divorce of Herod Antipas from the daughter of Aretas, and his unlawful marriage with Herodias—a crime which the scribes and Pharisees had not the courage to condemn like John the Baptist? Or, finally, must we, with Olshausen, take the idea of divorce in a spiritual sense, and apply it to the emancipation of believers from the yoke of the law, agreeably to Rom. 7 : 1, *et seq.*? No ; the explanation which we have given, as well as the authenticity of the context, appear to be sufficiently established by the parallels quoted (Matt. 5 : 18, 19 and 31, 32. 19 : 3, *et seq.* ; Mark 10 : 2, *et seq.*).

The saying of ver. 17, proclaiming the eternal duration of the law, has appeared to some critics incompatible with the *Pauline* character of Luke's Gospel. Hilgenfeld alleges that the canonical text of Luke is falsified, and that the true original form of this passage, as well as of many others, has been preserved by Marcion, who reads : "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle *of my sayings* to fail." But, 1. The manifest incompatibility of our canonical text with Marcion's system renders it, on the contrary, very probable that it was Marcion who in this case, as in so many others, accommodated the text to his dogmatic point of view. 2. Could Jesus have applied the word tittle to His own sayings before they had been expressed in writing? 3. The parallel, Matt. 5 : 18, proves that the expression in its original meaning really applied to the law. If such was the primary application in the mind of Jesus, would it not be extremely surprising if, after an earlier Luke had departed from it, the more modern Luke should have reverted to it? Besides, this supposition, combated by Zeller, is withdrawn by Volkmar, who first gave it forth ("Die Evangel.," p. 481). Zeller, however, supposes that the evangelist, feeling the anti-Pauline tendency of this saying, designedly inclosed it between two others, intended to show the reader that it was not to be taken in its literal sense. But would it not have been far simpler to omit it altogether? And does not so much artifice contrast with the simplicity of our Gospels?

According to the Talmud, Tract. Gittin (ix. 10), Hillel, the grandfather of Gamaliel, the man whom our moderns would adopt as the master of Jesus Christ, taught that the husband is entitled to put away his wife when she burns his dinner.* We can understand how, in view of such pharisaic teachings, Jesus felt the need of protesting, not only by affirming the maintenance of moral obligation as contained in the law, but even by announcing that the new doctrine would in this respect exceed the severity of the old, and would conclusively raise the moral obligation to the height of the ideal. The declaration of Jesus, ver. 17, about the maintenance of the law, is, besides, perfectly at one with St. Paul's view (1 Cor. 7 : 19) : "The keeping of the commandments of God is everything ;" comp. Rom. 2 : 12 : "As many as have sinned under the law, shall be judged by the law."

On the basis of this introduction, announcing to the Pharisees the end of their paraded show of righteousness and the advent of real holiness, there rises by way of example the following parable. To the words of ver. 15, *that which is highly esteemed among men*, there corresponds the representation of the sumptuous and brilliant life of the rich man ; to the predicate, *is an abomination in the sight of God* (same verse) the description of his punishment in Hades ; to the declaration of ver. 17 regarding the permanence of the law, the reply of Abraham : *they have Moses and the prophets.*

* "Jesus und Hillel," 1867, by Delitzsch, p. 27, where an answer is given to the forced interpretation which modern Jews give of this saying.

Vers. 19–31. *The Parable of the Wicked Rich Man.*—It is composed of two principal scenes, which correspond so exactly with one another, that in their correspondence we must seek the very idea of the parable; these are, the scene on the earth (vers. 19–22), and that in Hades (vers. 23–31).

The terrestrial scene, vers. 19–22.* It embraces four portraitures which, taken two and two, form counterparts of one another: the life of the rich man, ver. 19, and that of the poor man, vers. 20, 21; then the death of the former, ver. 22*a*, and that of the latter, ver. 22*b*. The description of the rich man's life presents two prominent features: the magnificence of his dress—*πορφύρα*, the upper dress, a woollen garment dyed purple, and *βύσσός*, the under garment, a tunic of fine linen; next, the sumptuousness of his habitual style of living—a splendid banquet daily. This description of the life of the rich of that day applied to the Jews as well as to the Gentiles. Nay, among the former, who sometimes regarded wealth as a sign of divine blessing, the enjoyments of that privileged state must have been indulged with so much the less scruple; so the Pharisees in particular seem to have done (20 : 46, 47). After the rich man, who first claims attention, our eyes are carried to the unhappy man laid at the entrance of his house, vers. 20 and 21. The Greek name Lazarus does not come, as some have thought, from *Lo-ezer, no help*, but from *El-ezer, God helps*; whence the form Eleazar, abbreviated by the Rabbins into *Leazar*; and hence Lazarus. This name, according to John 11, was common among the Jews. As this is the only case in which Jesus designates one of the personages of a parable by his name, this peculiarity must have a significance in the account. It is intended, doubtless, as the name so often was among the Jews, to describe the character of him who bears it. By this name, then, Jesus makes this personage the representation of that class of the Israelitish people which formed the opposite extreme of pharisaism—poor ones whose confidence was in God alone, the Aniim of the O. T., the pious indigent.

The gateway at the entrance of which he was laid is that which conducts in Eastern houses from the outside to the first court. The word *ἐβέβλητο, was thrown*, expresses the heedlessness with which he was laid down there and abandoned to the care of those who were constantly going and coming about this great house. The crumbs denote the remains of the meal which the servants would sometimes throw to him, but which were not enough to satisfy him. The omission of the words *τῶν ψιχίων* by some Alex. arises from the confusion of the two *τῶν* by an ancient copyist; these words are wrongly rejected by Tischendorf; they are to be preserved as the counterpart of the *drop of water*, ver. 24. The nakedness of the poor man contrasts with the rich man's elaborate toilet, as those crumbs do with his banquets. The words *ἀλλὰ καί, moreover*, which indicate a higher degree of endurance, forbid us to regard the feature of the dogs licking the sores of Lazarus as an alleviation of his miseries. Besides, this animal is never represented in the Bible, nor among the Orientals in general, in a favorable light. The licking of the poor man's unbandaged wounds by those unclean animals as they passed, is the last stroke of the picture of his nakedness and forsakenness.

To the contrast between the two lives there soon succeeds that between the two deaths, ver. 22, which introduces the contrast between the two states in the life to

* Ver. 20. ℵ. B. D. L. X. omit *ην* after *τις* and *ος* before *εβεβλητο*. Ver. 21 ℵ B. L. Italiq. omit *των ψιχιων*.

come. Lazarus dies first, exhausted by privations and sufferings. That very moment he finds in the heavenly world the sympathy which was refused to him here below. In Jewish theology, the angels are charged with receiving the souls of pious Israelites, and transporting them to that portion of Hades which is reserved for them. *Abraham's bosom*, a figure also common among the Rabbins, denotes either intimate communion in general (John 1 18), or more specially the place of honor at a feast (John 13 : 23) : this is naturally assigned to the newly-arrived stranger, all the more that his earthly sufferings demand a rich compensation. Abraham presides at the feast until the Messiah comes to take the first place, and the feast of the kingdom begins (13 : 25). Meyer concludes, from the fact that the interment of Lazarus is not mentioned, and from the object αὐτόν, *him*, that he was transported body and soul to Abraham's bosom. But so early as in the Targum of Canticles, we find the distinction between body and soul : "The righteous whose souls are carried by angels to paradise." The pronoun αὐτόν thus designates only his true self, the soul. The burial of Lazarus is not mentioned, for it took place without ceremony, or perhaps not at all. The body, claimed by no one, was thrown to the dunghill. The contrast to the rich man is evident. No angels to transport his soul ; but for his body, on the contrary, a splendid funeral procession.

What is the crime in the life of this rich man which accounts for the terrible condition described in the following scene? From the fact that it is not mentioned, the conclusion has been drawn that it must be simply his riches. The Tübingen school says : he is condemned as being rich, and Lazarus is saved as being poor. And M. Rénan thinks that the parable should be entitled, not the parable of the wicked rich man, but merely of the rich man. Here, it is said, we meet again with the Ebionite heresy of Luke (De Wette) But how has it escaped observation, that if no crime properly so called is laid to the charge of the rich man, his misdeed is nevertheless clearly indicated ; and it is no other than the very existence of this poor man laid at his gate in destitution, without any relief being brought to his wants. Such is the *corpus delicti*. The crime of the life described ver. 19, is the fact referred to vers. 20 and 21. Every social contrast between the more and the less, either in respect of fortune, or strength, or acquirement, or even piety, is permitted and willed by God only with a view to its being neutralized by man's free agency. This is a task assigned from on high, the means of forming those bonds of love which are our treasure in heaven (12 : 33, 34). To neglect this offer is to procure for one's self an analogous contrast in the other life—a contrast which shall be capable of being sweetened for us no more than we have ourselves sweetened it in the life below. It would be hard to understand how, if wealth as such were the rich man's sin, the celestial banquet could be presided over by Abraham, the richest of the rich in Israel. As to Lazarus, the real cause of the welcome which he finds in the world to come is not his poverty, but that which is already pointed out by his name : *God is my help*.

The scene from beyond the tomb, vers. 23–31, offers a contrast exactly corresponding to the terrestrial scene. We do not attempt to distinguish in the representation what should be taken in a figurative sense and what strictly. The realities of the spiritual world can only be expressed by figures ; but, as has been said, those figures are the figures of something. The colors are almost all borrowed from the palette of the Rabbins ; but the thought which clothes itself in those figures that it may become palpable, is, as we shall see, the original and personal thought of Jesus.

Of the two interviews forming this scene, the first relates to the rich man's lot (vers. 23–26), the second to that of his brethren (vers. 27–31).

Vers. 23–26.* After the short sleep of death, what an awakening! The idea of suffering does not lie in the words ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ, which our versions render by: *in hell. Scheol* (Heb.), *Hades* (Gr.), the *Inferi* or *infernal regions* (Lat.), simply denote the abode of the dead, without distinguishing the different conditions which it may include, in opposition to the land of the living. *Paradise* (23 : 43) as well as *Gehenna* (12 : 5) forms part of it. Hence, also, from the midst of his punishment the rich man can behold Abraham and Lazarus. The notion of pain is actually found only in the words: *being in torments*. On Abraham in the abode of the dead, comp. John 8 : 56, where Jesus speaks without figure. The plural τοῖς κόλποις, substituted for the singular (ver. 22), denotes fulness; a whole region is meant where a company is gathered together. The situation, ver. 24 *et seq.*, is very similar to that of the dialogues of the dead found in the ancients, and particularly in the Rabbins. Φωνήσας, *calling in a loud voice*, corresponds to μακρόθεν, *afar off*, ver. 23. Nothing more severe for those Pharisees, who made a genealogical tree the foundation of their salvation, than this address put into the mouth of the poor condemned man: *Father Abraham!* "All the circumcised are safe," said the Rabbins; therefore, was not circumcised equivalent to son of Abraham? In this situation, there arises in the mind of the rich man a thought which had never occurred to him while he was on the earth, namely, that the contrast between abundance and destitution may have its utility for him who is in want. He expresses his discovery with a simplicity in which shamelessness disputes the palm with innocence. The gen. ὕδατος with βάπτειν: to drop *water*; this expression denotes water falling drop by drop from the finger which has been immersed in it; it thus corresponds to the word *crumbs*, ver. 21.

On *flame*, comp. Mark 9 : 43–48, 49. Lustful desires, inflamed and fed by boundless gratification, change into torture for the soul as soon as it is deprived of the external objects which correspond to them, and from the body by which it communicates with them. The address: *my son*, in the mouth of Abraham, is more poignant still than that of *Father Abraham* in that of the rich man. Abraham acknowledges the reality of the civil state appealed to, and yet this man is and remains in Gehenna! The word *remember* is the central one of the parable; for it forms the bond between the two scenes, that of the earth and that of Hades. "Recall the contrast which thou didst leave unbroken on the earth . . . and thou shalt understand that the present corresponding contrast cannot be alleviated without injustice. Thou hast let the time pass for making Lazarus thy friend (16 : 8, 9); he can now do nothing for thee." In ἀπέλαβες, *thou receivedst*, there is, as in the ἀπέχειν, Matt. 6 : 2, 5, 16, the notion of receiving by appropriating greedily for the purpose of enjoyment. The selfish appropriation of goods was not tempered in him by the free munificence of love. He thought only of draining to the very bottom the cup of pleasure which was at his lips. The same idea is expressed by the pronoun σοῦ added to ἀγαθά, "thy good things;" this qualification is not added to κακά, in the second clause; Abraham says simply: "evil things." God trains the human soul by joys and by sorrows. The education of every soul demands a certain sum of both. This thought

* Ver. 25. 7 Mjj. 30 Mnn. Vss. omit σύ after απελαβες. Instead of οδε (T. R. with some Mnn.), all the documents: ωδε. Ver. 26. ℵ. B. L. It^{plerique}, εν instead of επι before πασι. Instead of εντευθεν (T. R. with K. Π. some Mnn.), all the documents, ενθεν. ℵ. B. D. omit οι before εκειθεν.

forms the foundation of ver. 25. It refers exclusively to the pedagogical economy here below or in the world above. The words *comforted* and *tormented* are not the equivalents of *saved* and *damned*, absolutely taken. Nothing could be final among the members of the ancient covenant till they had been brought into contact with Jesus Christ.* "The gospel," says St. Peter (1 Ep. 4 : 6), "was preached to them that are dead, that they might be [capable of being] judged." The knowledge of Jesus Christ is the condition on which the pronouncing of the final sentence on every soul is based. The hour of this judgment has not yet struck for the rich man. Consequently this verse neither teaches salvation by poverty nor damnation by riches; ὧδε, *here*, which is read by all the Mjj, is preferable to ὅδε, *he*. *Here* is opposed to: *in his lifetime*.

Ver. 26. But even supposing that some concession might be made in respect of justice, there is another reason which cuts off all hope—the impossibility of the thing. The Rabbins represent the two parts of Hades as separated by a wall; Jesus here substitutes a gulf, a figure which agrees better with the entire description. It is the emblem of God's inflexible decree. Only from the fact that this gulf cannot be crossed at present, it does not follow that it may not be so one day by means of a bridge offered to repentant Jews (comp. Matt. 12 : 32).† The omission of *οἱ* before *ἐκεῖθεν*, by the Alex., identifies those who pass with those who repass.

Vers. 27–31.‡ *The Second Conversation.*—The rich man acquiesces so far as his own person is concerned. But he intercedes for his brethren still in life. And again it is Lazarus who must busy himself on their behalf! What is the thought contained in this conclusion? Starting from the standpoint that the idea of the parable is the condemnation of wealth, De Wette, the Tübingen school, and Weizsäcker himself find this last part entirely out of keeping with the rest of the description. For it is their impenitence face to face with the law and the prophets which exposes the five brethren to danger, and not their being rich men. They allege therefore that Luke at his own hand has added this conclusion, with the view of transforming a doctrine which was originally Ebionite and Judeo-Christian into one anti Judaic or Pauline. The rich man, who, in the original meaning of the similitude, simply represented riches, becomes in this conclusion the type of Jewish unbelief in respect of the resurrection of Jesus. Weizsäcker goes the length of regarding Lazarus as the representative of the Gentiles despised by the Jews. This last idea is incompatible with the Jewish name Lazarus, as well as with the place awarded to him in Abraham's bosom, the gathering place of pious Jews. As to the rich man, from the beginning he represents not the rich in general, but the rich man hardened by well-being, the Pharisee, whose heart, puffed up with pride, is closed to sympathy with the suffering. This appears from the expressions: *Father Abraham, my son*, vers. 24, 25, which are as it were the motto of Israelitish formalism (Matt. 3 : 7–9; John 8 : 39). This conclusion is thus nothing else than the practical application of the parable, which, instead of being presented to his hearers in the form of an abstract lesson, is given as the con-

* This generalization is based on an interpretation of 1 Pet. 4 : 6, determined by connecting it with chap. 3 : 19, 20. But this connection is not certain, nor is there anything like agreement as to the meaning of either text.—J. H.

† Our author, in quoting this verse in this connection, is opposed to the weightiest authorities. The words "in this world (age) or the world to come," are correctly taken by De Wette, Alford, etc., as equivalent to *never*.—J. H.

‡ Ver. 29. ℵ. B. L. omit αὐτῷ after λέγει or λέγει δέ.

tinuation of the scene itself. It is exactly the same in the parable of the prodigal son, in which the elder son exhibits the Pharisees with their murmurings, and the divine answer. The first portrait, vers. 19–21, depicted the sin of the rich man; the second, vers. 22–26, his punishment. In this appendix: Jesus unveils to His hearers the cause of this misery, the absence of *μετάνοια, repentance*, and for those who wished to profit by the warning, the means of preventing the lot which threatens them at the moment of their death: taking to heart Moses and the prophets very differently from what they have ever done. There must pass within them what took place in the prodigal son, the figure of the publicans (15 : 17 : *he came to himself*), and in the steward, the type of the new believers (16 : 3 : *he said within himself*): that act of solemn self-examination in which the heart is broken at the thought of its sins, and which impresses an entirely new direction on the life, and on the employment of earthly goods in particular. To reject this conclusion is therefore to break the arrow-point shot by the hand of Jesus at the consciences of His hearers.

Ver. 27. The five brethren cannot represent the rich of this world in general, and as little the Jews who remained unbelieving in respect of Jesus Christ. They are Jews living in a privileged, brilliant condition, like that of the rich man—the Pharisees, whom this man represented; this relation is the idea expressed by the image of the kinship which connects them. Some have imagined that those five brethren are the five sons of the high priest Annas. Would Jesus have condescended to such personalities? The forms of address: *father*, ver. 27, *father Abraham*, ver. 30, continue to define the meaning of this principal personage very clearly. *Διαμαρτύρεσθαι*, ver. 28, does not signify only: to declare, but to testify in such a way that the truth pierces through the wrappings of a hardened conscience (*διά*). In putting this request into the rich man's mouth, Jesus undoubtedly alludes to that thirst for miracles, for extraordinary and palpable manifestations, which He never failed to meet among His adversaries, and which He refused to satisfy. Such demands charge with insufficiency the means of repentance which God had all along placed in Israel. Some commentators, unable to allow any good feeling in one damned, have attributed this prayer of the rich man to a selfish aim. According to them, he dreaded the time when his own sufferings would be aggravated by seeing those of his brethren. But would not even this fear still suppose in him a remnant of love? And why represent him as destitute of all human feeling? He is not yet, we have seen, damned in the absolute sense of the word. If we must seek a selfish alloy in this prayer, it can only be the desire to excuse himself, by giving it to be understood, that if he had been sufficiently warned he would not have been where he is.

Abraham teaches *all his sons* by his reply, ver. 29, with what earnestness they should henceforth *listen* to the reading of that law and those prophets, the latter of which they had, up till now, heard or even studied in vain (John 5 : 38, 39). The subject has nothing to do with unbelief regarding Jesus; the situation of this saying is purely Jewish. The rich man insists. His answer, *Nay, father Abraham*, ver. 30, depicts the Rabbinical spirit of disputation and pharisaic effrontery. Repentance would produce, he fully acknowledges, a life wholly different from his own (such as it has been described, ver. 19); but the law without miracles would not suffice to produce this state of mind. Jesus unveils, ver. 31, the complete illusion belonging to this idea of conversion by means of great miraculous interpositions. He whom the law and the prophets bring not to the conviction of his sins, will be as little led to it by the sight even of one raised from the dead. After the first emotion of astonishment and ter-

ror, criticism will awake saying, Hallucination ! and carnal security, shaken for a moment, will reassert itself. Jesus not having showed Himself, and not having preached to the Jews after His resurrection, this saying cannot be an invention of Luke borrowed from that event.

Such is the terrible answer of Jesus to the derision of His adversaries, the proud and covetous Pharisees, ver. 14. He shows them their portrait, the likeness of their present life, and their lot after death. Now they know what they are in the eyes of God (19–21), and what awaits them (23–35) ; they know also the real cause of their near perdition, and the only means which can yet avert it (27–31).

From this study it follows : 1. That all the indications of the preface (vers. 14–18) are entirely justified ; in particular, that the *Φαρισαῖοι* (*the Pharisees*), ver. 14, is the real key of the parable. 2. That there reigns throughout this description a perfect unity of idea, and that the context furnishes no well-founded reason for distinguishing between an original parable and a later rehandling. 3. That the piece as a whole, in all its details, are in direct correspondence with the historical situation in which Jesus was teaching, and find their natural explanation without any need of having recourse to the later circumstances of apostolic times. 4. That this passage furnishes no proof of an Ebionite document anterior to our Gospel, and forming one of the essential materials employed by the author. Hilgenfeld says (" Die Evangel." p. 102) : " *Nowhere* does our Gospel allow us to distinguish so clearly the original writing of which it is the anti-Jewish and Pauline handling." Nowhere so clearly ! This passage proving nothing, it follows that the others prove less than nothing.

This character, not anti-Jewish, but certainly anti-pharisaic, belongs equally to the whole series of pieces which we have just surveyed (comp. 11 : 37–12 : 12) ; then (after an interruption), 13 : 10–31, 14 : 1, 5 : 2, 16 : 14. The parable of the unfaithful steward is also connected with this series by the law of contrast. Here then, is the time of the most intense struggle between Jesus and pharisaism, in Galilee, like the contemporaneous period, John 7–10, in Judea.

7. *Various Sayings :* 17 : 1–10.—This piece contains four brief lessons, placed here without introduction, and between which it is impossible to establish a connection. Olshausen and Meyer have attempted to connect them with one another and with what precedes. The *offence*, vers. 1 and 2, according to them, is either that which the rich man gave to his brethren, or that which the Pharisees gave to weak believers, by preventing them from declaring themselves for Christ. But how is the expression, *one of these little ones* (ver. 2), applicable to the rich man's brethren ? And in the second sense, should not the warning be addressed to the adversaries rather than *unto the disciples* (ver. 1) ? The teaching regarding *pardon* (vers. 3, 4) is taken to refer to the arrogant harshness of the Pharisees, who did not allow the publicans to appropriate the pardon of sins (the offence, vers. 1, 2) ; or rancor is regarded as one of those offences of which we must beware ; or, finally, a climax is supposed : it is not enough not to do evil to others (vers. 1, 2) ; we should also pardon the evil which they do to us (vers. 3 and 4). These connections, more or less ingenious, are artificial ; they are like those by which one succeeds in tagging together given rhymes. The petition of the apostles (vers. 5 and 6) is held to find its occasion in the feeling of their powerlessness to pardon. But in this sense, Jesus should have spoken in His reply, not of the faith which works external miracles, but of that which works by love. Lastly, the doctrine taught of the non-meritoriousness of works (vers. 7–10) is alleged to be introduced by this idea, that the greatest miracles wrought by faith confer no merit on man. But how could miracles of faith be described as *διαταχθέντα*, *things commanded ?* De Wette is therefore right in declining to find a connection between those different sayings. Let us add that several of them are placed by Matthew and Mark

in historical circumstances, where they have their entire appropriateness. We shall be able to state the critical result when we come to sum up.

Vers. 1 and 2.* *Offences.*—"Then said He unto the disciples, It is impossible but that offences (scandals) will come: but woe unto him through whom they come! 2. It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones. Take heed to yourselves." The formula *εἶπε δέ, then said He* (aor.), has not the same weight as the *ἔλεγε δέ, He was saying to them*, the significance of which in Luke we have often remarked. It is the simple historical fact. *Ἀνεκδεκτόν, inadmissible.* The absence of offences is a supposition which cannot be admitted in the sinful state in which the world is plunged. The determining particle *τοῦ* is authentic. The form, (*the*) offences (*τά*), denotes the entire category of facts of this kind. The reading *μύλος ὀνικός*, a millstone moved by an ass, is undoubtedly borrowed from Matthew; we must adopt, with the Alex., *λίθος μυλικός*, a millstone of smaller dimensions, moved by the hand (ver. 35). The punishment to which ver. 2 alludes was usual among many ancient peoples, and is so still in the East. The reading of several copies of the Itala, which is also found in Marcion, "It were better for him that he had never been born, or that a stone . . ." arises, no doubt, from an ancient gloss taken from Matt. 26 : 24. This is confirmed by the fact that Clemens Romanus combines in his 1 Cor. 46 the two passages, Matt. 18 : 6, 7 (parallel to ours) and Matt. 26 : 24. The little ones are beginners in the faith. The final warning, Take heed . . . is occasioned, on the one hand, by the extreme facility of causing offence (ver. 1); on the other, by the terrible danger to which it exposes him who causes it (ver. 2). The lost soul, like an eternal burden, is bound to him who has dragged it into evil, and in turn drags him into the abyss.

The same warning is found Matt. 18 : 6 and Mark 9 : 42. The offence which gave rise to it may be in this context, either that which the disciples had given one another in the strife which had taken place between them, or that which they had caused to the man in whom faith had just dawned (one of these little ones), and who was manifesting it by curing the possessed. Luke evidently did not know this connection; for he would not have failed to indicate it—he who seeks out historical situations with so much care. Had he not, besides, himself mentioned those two facts (9 : 46-50), and might he not have connected this admonition with them as Mark does? Luke, therefore, did not possess this original Mark, which Holtzmann regards as one of his principal sources; otherwise he would not have detached this saying from the fact which gave rise to it. But the account given by Matthew and Mark proves the truth of Luke's introduction, "He said unto the disciples," and the accuracy of the document from which he derived this precept.

Vers. 3 and 4.† *The Pardon of Trespasses.*—"If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him. 4. And if he trespass against thee seven

* Ver. 1. 9 Mjj. 25 Mnn. Vss. omit *αυτου* after *μαθητας*. T. R., with some Mnn., only omits *του* before *σκανδαλα*. ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$, *πλην ουαι* instead of *ουαι δε*. Ver. 2. It^{plerique}, *ει ουκ εγεννηθη η λιθος . . .* Marcion appears to have read thus; Clem. Rom. perhaps. ℵ. B. D. L. 20 Mnn. It Vg., *λιθος μυλικος* instead of *μυλος ονικος*.

† Ver. 3. 5 Mjj. some Mnn. Vss. omit *δε* after *εαν*. ℵ. A. B. L. It^{plerique}, omit *εις σε* after *αμαρτη* (words taken, perhaps, from ver. 4 or from Matt. 18 : 15). Ver. 4. ℵ. B. D. L. X. some Mnn. It^{plerique}, omit *της ημερας*. Instead of *επι σε*, which T. R., with some Mnn., reads, 7 Mjj. read *προς σε*. 12 Mjj. 125 Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ omit all government.

times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent, thou shalt forgive him." Holiness and love meet together in this precept: holiness begins with rebuking; then, when the rebuke has once been taken, love pardons. The pardon to be granted to our brethren has no other limit than their repenting, and the confession by which it is expressed.

Matthew (18 : 15–22) places this precept in the same discourse as the preceding; it probably referred also to the altercation which had taken place between the disciples on that occasion. But there what gives rise to it is a characteristic question of Peter, which Luke did not know; otherwise he would not have omitted it; comp. 12 : 41, where he carefully mentions a similar question put by the same apostle. Mark omits this precept about pardon; but at the end of the same discourse we find this remarkable exhortation (9 : 50): "Have salt in yourselves (use severity toward yourselves; comp. 5 : 43–48), and have peace with one another"—a saying which has substantially the same meaning as our precept on the subject of pardon. What a proof both of the radical authenticity of the sayings of Jesus and of the fragmentary manner in which tradition had preserved them, as well as of the diversity of the sources from which our evangelists derived them!

Vers. 5 and 6.* *Faith.*—"And the apostles said unto the Lord, Increase our faith. 6. And the Lord said, If ye had faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye might say unto this sycamine tree, Be thou plucked up by the root, and be thou planted in the sea; and it should obey you." This request of the disciples must have been called forth by some manifestation of the extraordinary power of Jesus, with which Luke was unacquainted. The literal force of the word which the disciples use, "Add to our faith," assumes that they think they have some. Jesus does not deny it; but He reduces this having to the feeblest imaginable quantity, since the smallest organic body is too large as an emblem of it. The only real power in the universe is the divine will. The human will, which has discovered the secret of blending with this force of forces, is raised, in virtue of this union, to omnipotence; and from the time it becomes conscious of this privilege, it acts without obstruction, even in the domain of nature, if the kingdom of God so requires. Perhaps the sycamine to which Jesus points is, in His view, the emblem of the kingdom of God, and the *sea* (here the shore, the pure sand) that of the heathen world, that, till now, barren soil in which, by the faith and the prayers of the disciples, the divine work is henceforth to be planted and to prosper.

Matthew twice presents a saying similar to that of ver. 6, and both times in a definite situation; first, after the healing of the lunatic son, and in contrast to the apostles' lack of faith (17 : 20, 21). Only in the two cases it is a *mountain* which is to be cast into the sea. Mark, who in narrating the cursing of the fig-tree shows himself the most accurately informed, there reproduces this parable almost in the same way as Matthew; only he prefaces it with the words, "Have faith in God," and connects with it an exhortation to pardon as the condition of prayer being heard. No doubt, owing to the proverbial character of this saying, it may have been frequently repeated. But there is a very remarkable dovetailing between Luke and the two others, Mark especially. Do not the words of Jesus in Mark, *Have faith in God and . . .* perfectly explain the prayer of the apostles in Luke, *Increase our faith?* Here, as at 12 : 41 (comp. with Mark 13 : 37), the one evangelist has preserved one part of the conversation, the other another. With a common written source, is that intelligible? As to the admonition regarding pardon, which in Mark follows this exhortation to faith (11 : 24, 25), it sustains to the question of Peter (Matt. 18 : 21), and the exhortation in Luke (vers. 3, 4), a relation similar to that which we have just

* Ver. 6. ℵ. D. L. X. omit ταυτῃ.

observed between Luke 12 : 41 and Mark 13 : 37. They are fragments of one whole, the grouping of which it is not difficult to restore.

Vers. 7–10.* *The Non-meritoriousness of Works.*—"But which of you, having a servant plowing or feeding cattle, will say unto him by and by, when he is come from the field, Go and sit down to meat? 8. And will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself, and serve me, till I have eaten and drunken; and afterward thou shalt eat and drink? 9. Doth he thank that servant because he did the things that were commanded him? I trow not. 10. So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do." This saying, which has no connection with what immediately precedes, does not the less admirably close this series of exhortations given by Jesus, which almost all relate to pharisaism; it is peculiar to Luke. A slave returns in the evening, after having labored all day in the fields. Does the master give himself up to extraordinary demonstrations of pleasure? No; everything goes on in the house according to the established order. From the work of the day, the servant simply passes to that of the evening; he dresses the viands, and serves at table as long (ἕως, or better still, ἕως ἄν) as his master pleases to eat and drink. And only then may he himself take his meal. So the most irreproachable of men must say to himself that he has done nothing but pay his debt to God; does not God on His side provide for all his wants? From the standpoint of right, they are quits on both sides. The word ἀχρεῖος, *unprofitable*, here signifies: *one who has rendered no service* (beyond what was due). This estimation of human work is true in the sphere of right where pharisaism plants itself, and it crushes this system in the dust by denying, along with all human merit, all obligation on God's part to recompense man; and this estimate should remain that of every man when he values his work in the presence of God. But there is a sphere higher than that of right, that of love; and in this latter another labor on man's part, that of joyful devotion, and another estimate on God's part, that of the love which is rejoiced by love. Jesus has described this other point of view, 12 : 36, 37. Holtzmann thinks it impossible that this exhortation should have been addressed to the disciples (ver. 1). But is not the pharisaic tendency ever ready to spring up again in the hearts of believers? and does it not cling like a gnawing worm to fidelity itself? The words: *I trow not*, are mistakenly rejected by the Alex. Perhaps the οὐ δοκω has been confounded with the οὕτω which follows.

How are we to explain the position of those four exhortations in our Gospel, and their juxtaposition, without any logical bond? According to Holtzmann,† Luke is about to return to his great historical source, the proto-Mark, which he had left since 9 : 51, to work the collection of discourses, the *Logia* (comp. 18 : 15, where the narrative of Luke begins again to move parallel to that of the two others); and hence he inserts here by anticipation the two exhortations, vers. 1–4, which he borrows from this document (A); then he relates further (vers. 5–10) two sayings which he had forgotten, and which he takes from the *Logia* (A), which he is about to quit. But, 1. Why in this case should he not have put these last *in the first place* (which was the natural order, since all the preceding was taken from A), and the two first *afterward*.

* Ver. 7. ℵ. B. D. L. X. 15 Mnn. Vss. add αυτω after ερει. Ver 9. 6 Mjj. It$^{aliq.}$ omit εκεινω after δουλω. 17 Mjj. 130 Mnn. omit αυτω. ℵ. B. L. X. 6 Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ omit ου δοκω. Ver. 10. The MSS. are divided between ωφειλομεν and οφειλομεν.

† "Already, 17 : 1–4, Luke attempts to return to A.; then to finish, he gives, besides, several passages taken from A." (p. 156).

(which was not less natural, since Luke is about to return to A)? Besides, 2. Has not the exegesis convinced us at every word that Luke certainly did not take all those sayings from the same written source as Mark and Matthew? The only explanation which can be given of the fragmentary character of this piece appears to us to be the following: Luke had up to this point related a series of exhortations given by Jesus, the occasion of which he was able to a certain extent to indicate; but he found some in his sources which were mentioned without any historical indication. It is this remnant scrap at the bottom of the portfolio, if I may so speak, which he delivers to us as it was, and without any introduction. Hence follow two consequences: 1. Luke's introductions in this part are not of his inventing. For why could not his ingenious mind have provided for these last exhortations as well as for all the preceding? A historical case like those of 11 : 1, 45, 12 : 13, 41, etc., was not difficult to imagine. 2. There is no better proof of the historical reality of the sayings of Jesus quoted in our Syn., than this fragmentary character which surprises us. Discourses which the disciples had put into the mouth of their Master would not have presented this broken appearance.

THIRD CYCLE.—CHAP. 17 : 11–19 : 27.

The last Scenes of the Journey.

This third section brings us to Bethany, to the gates of Jerusalem, and to the morning of Palm Day. It seems to me evident that Luke, in ver. 11, intends simply to indicate the continuation of the journey begun 9 : 51, and not, as Wiessler will have it, the beginning of a different journey. In consequence of the multiplicity of events related, Luke reminds us from time to time of the general situation. It is in the course of this third section that his narrative rejoins that of the two other Syn. (18 : 15 *et seq.*), at the time when children are brought to Jesus that He may bless them. This event being expressly placed in Perea by Matthew and Mark, it is clear that the following events must have taken place at the time when Jesus was about to cross the Jordan, or had just passed it.

1. *The Ten Lepers:* 17 : 11–19.—Vers. 11–19.* Ver. 11, even in its construction, reminds us of 9 : 51. The *καὶ αὐτός* has here, as well as there, peculiar force. The caravans of Galilee took either the Samaritan route or the Perean. Jesus follows neither; He makes one for Himself, the result of His deliberate wish, which is intermediate between the two—a fact which seems to be expressed by the so marked resuming of the subject (*καὶ αὐτός*). The phrase *διὰ μεσοῦ* may signify in Greek: while travelling through both of those provinces, or while passing between them. Olshausen takes the first sense: he alleges that from Ephraim, whither Jesus retired after the resurrection of Lazarus (John 11 : 54), He visited Galilee once more, thus traversing from south to north, first Samaria, and then Galilee. Gess (p. 74) also regards this return from Ephraim to Capernaum as probable.† But the governed clause *to Jerusalem* would in this sense be real irony. The second sense is therefore the only

* Ver. 11. ℵ. B. L. omit *αυτον* after *πορευεσθαι*. ℵ. B. L., *δια μεσον* instead of *δια μεσον*. Ver. 12. ℵ. L. some Mnn., *υπηντησαν* instead of *απηντησαν*. The same Mjj. omit *αυτω*.

† Gess's reason is the scene of the didrachma, Matt. 17 : 24–27; for the collection for the temple was made in March. But in the year which preceded His death, Jesus may possibly not have paid till summer the tribute which was properly due in spring. The form of the collector's question, Matt., ver. 24, seems to suppose a payment which was at once voluntary and in arrears. It is not therefore necessary, on this ground, to hold a return from Capernaum to Galilee immediately before the last Passover.

possible one: Jesus was passing along the confines of the two provinces. This meaning is confirmed by the absence of the article before the two proper names: *Samaria and Galilee.* He directed his steps from west to east, toward the Jordan, which He must cross to enter Perea—a fact which harmonizes, as we have seen, with Matt. 19 : 1, Mark 10 : 1, and even John 10 : 40–42. Luke probably recalls here this general situation in view of the following narrative, in which we find a Samaritan leper mingling with Jewish lepers. Community of suffering had, in their case, broken down the national barrier. Less bold than the leper of chap. 6, those unhappy men kept at a distance, according to the law, Lev. 13 : 46. The space which a leper was bound to keep between him and every other person is estimated by some at 4, by others at 100 cubits. The cry which they uttered with one voice on perceiving Jesus, draws His attention to the pitiable sight. Without even telling them of their cure, He bids them go and give thanks for it. There is a dash, as it were, of triumphant joy in this unexpected order. *As they go* (ἐν τῷ ὑπάγειν), they observe the first symptoms of the cure which has been wrought. Immediately one of them, seized with an irresistible emotion of gratitude, turns back, uttering loud cries of joy and adoration; and arrived in the presence of Jesus, he prostrates himself at His feet in thanksgiving. The difference is to be observed between δοξάζειν, *glorifying*, applied to God, and εὐχαριστεῖν, *giving thanks*, applied to Jesus. As He recognizes him to be a Samaritan, Jesus feels to the quick the difference between those simple hearts, within which there yet vibrates the natural feeling of gratitude, and Jewish hearts, incrusted all over with pharisaic pride and ingratitude; and immediately, no doubt, the lot of His gospel in the world is presented to His mind. But He contents Himself with bringing into view the present contrast. Εὑρέθησαν has not for its subject the participle ὑποστρέψαντες, taken substantively, but ἄλλοι understood. Bleek refers the last words: *thy faith hath saved thee*, to the physical cure which Jesus would confirm to the sufferer by leading him to develop that disposition of faith which has procured it for him. But have we not here rather a new blessing, of which Jesus gives special assurance to this leper? The faith of which Jesus speaks is not merely that which brought him at the first, but more still that which has brought him back. By this return he has sealed forever the previous transitory connection which his cure had formed between Jesus and him; he recognizes His word as the instrument of the miracle; he unites himself closely to the entire person of Him whose power only he had sought at the first. And thereby his physical cure is transformed into a moral cure, into salvation.

Criticism suspects this narrative on account of its universalistic tendency. But if it had been invented with a didactic aim, would the lesson to be drawn from it have been so completely passed over in silence? We must in this case also suspect the healing of the Gentile centurion's servant in Matthew; and that with more reason still, because Jesus insists on the general lesson to be derived from the event.

2. *The Messiah's Coming:* 17 : 20–18 : 8.—This piece embraces: 1*st.* A question put by the Pharisees respecting the time of the appearance of the kingdom of God, and the answer of Jesus (vers. 20, 21); 2*d.* A discourse addressed by Jesus to His disciples on the same subject (vers. 22–37); 3*d.* The parable of the unjust judge, which applies the subject treated practically to believers (18 : 1–8).

1*st.* Vers. 20 and 21.* *The Spirituality of the Kingdom.*—"And when He was de-

* Ver. 21. ℵ. B. L. omit ἰδου before εκει.

manded of the Pharisees when the kingdom of God should come, He answered them, and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation. 21. Neither shall they say, Lo here! or, Lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you." It is known with what impatience the Pharisees waited for the manifestations of the Messianic kingdom. It is natural that they should desire to know the opinion of Jesus on the subject. Besides, they would have been glad to embarrass Him in the matter, or to drag from Him some heresy. Their question rested on a purely external view of this divine kingdom; His advent appeared to their mind as a great and sudden dramatic act. In the gospel point of view, this expectation is certainly not altogether false; but humanity must be prepared for the new external and divine state of things by a spiritual work wrought in the depths of the heart; and it is this internal advent which Jesus thinks good to put first in relief before such interlocutors. The side of the truth which He thinks proper to set forth is, as usual, that which is mistaken by the parties addressing Him. To the Pharisee Nicodemus, who came to Him with a question analogous to that which His *confrères* are now putting, Jesus replies exactly in the same way. The expression: μετὰ παρατηρήσεως, *in such a way as to be observed*, relates to the observation of objects falling under the senses. The present ἔρχεται, *cometh*, is that of the idea. Now, since the kingdom is not established in a visible manner, it might happen that it should be present without men suspecting it (11 : 20). And this is exactly the case (11 : 20 : *has surprised you*).

Lo here, lo there—these words express the impression of those who think they see it coming; Jesus puts in opposition to them His own *behold*. This last relates to the surprise which should be felt by His hearers on learning that the kingdom is already present. The words ἐντὸς ὑμῶν are explained by almost all modern interpreters in the sense of, *in the midst of you*. Philologically this meaning is possible; it may be harmonized with the γάρ. But the verb ἐστιν would in this case necessarily require to be put before the regimen; for this verb *is* would have the emphasis, "it is really present." The idea *among you* would be secondary. If the regimen ἐντὸς ὑμῶν has the emphasis (and its place proves that it has), it can only be because these words contain the reason introduced by *for*. They should therefore serve to prove that the kingdom of God may have come without its coming being remarked; and this is what follows from its internal, spiritual nature. The meaning of this regimen is therefore, *within you*. Besides, the prep. ἐντός, *within*, always includes a contrast to the idea *without*. If, therefore, we give to it here the meaning of *among*, we must still suppose an understood contrast, that between the Jews as people within, and the Gentiles as people without. There is nothing in the context giving rise to such an antithesis. In giving to ἐντός the meaning *within*, we are led back to the idea expressed in the answer of Jesus to Nicodemus: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God," which confirms our explanation. Ἐστί is, like ἔρχεται, the present of essence.

2*d*. Vers. 22–37. *The Coming of the Kingdom.*—To the Pharisees Jesus declared what they did not know, the spiritual essence of the kingdom. But Jesus did not mean to deny the external and final appearing of a divine state of things. To develop this other side of the truth, He turns to His disciples, because it is only to those who possess something of His spiritual life that He can speak profitably of His future return. Thus it is that the treatment of the same subject is modified, according to the character of those whom Jesus addresses. Besides, the abstract idea of the coming of the kingdom is now presented as the reappearing of Jesus Himself.

The truth could only be expounded in this aspect to believers. We may see with what justice the *Revue de Théologie* alleges : " The first two verses (vers. 20, 21) are in contradiction to the rest, and have no connection with what follows !" (1867, p. 386).

The discourse of Jesus bears on three points : 1*st*. When and how will Jesus reappear (vers. 22–25) ? 2*d*. What will be the state of the world then (vers. 26–30) ? 3*d*. What will be the moral condition of salvation in that last crisis (vers. 31–37) ?

Vers. 22–25.* " And He said unto the disciples, The days will come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and ye shall not see it. 23. And they shall say to you, See here ! or, see there ! go not after them, nor follow them. 24. For as the lightning, that lighteneth out of the one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven ; so shall also the Son of man be in His day. 25. But first must He suffer many things, and be rejected of this generation." The course of thought is this : The kingdom, in the sense understood by the Pharisees, will not come immediately (ver. 22) ; and when it shall come, no uncertainty will be felt about His appearing (vers. 23, 24). Ver. 25 returns to the idea of ver. 22.

Ἡμέραι (ver. 22), *days*, long days, during which there will be time to sigh for the visible presence of the Master. Comp. 5 : 35. The desire *to see one of the days of the Son of man* may refer either to the painful regret of the Church when she recalls the happiness enjoyed by her while He was present on the earth, or to her impatient waiting for some manifestation from on high announcing that the day is at length near. Substantially, the first meaning leads to the second, as regret does to desire ; but the second idea is the dominant one, according to the context. When the apostles or their successors shall have passed a long time on the earth in the absence of their Lord, when they shall be at the end of their preaching and their apologetic demonstrations, and when around them scepticism, materialism, pantheism, and deism shall more and more gain the ascendency, then there shall be formed in their souls an ardent longing for that Lord who keeps silence and remains hid ; they will call for some divine manifestation, *a single one* (μίαν), like that of the old days, to refresh their hearts and sustain the fainting Church. But to the end, the task will be to walk by faith (οὐκ ὄψεσθε, *ye shall not see*). Need we be astonished if in such circumstances the faith of the great majority verges to extinction (18 : 8) ?

With this heightening of expectation among believers there will correspond the seducing appeals of falsehood (ver. 23). Literally taken, this verse is in contradiction to ver. 21. But ver. 21 related to the spiritual kingdom, whose coming cannot be observed or proclaimed, while the subject now in question is the visible kingdom, the appearing of which shall be falsely announced. Why shall those announcements be necessarily false ? Ver. 24 gives the explanation. Gess exhibits the application of this teaching, on the one hand, to the folly of the Romanists who will have no Church without a visible head, and, on the other, to that of Protestant sectaries who expect the appearing of the kingdom of God to-day in Palestine, to-morrow in Russia, etc.

Ver. 24 The Lord's coming will be universal and instantaneous. Men do not run here or there to see a flash of lightning : it shines simultaneously on all points of the horizon. So the Lord will appear at the same moment to the view of all living. His appearances as the Risen One in the upper room, when closed, are the prelude of this last advent. But if He is to return, He must go away, go away persecuted. This

* Ver. 23. ℵ. B[3] L., ἰδου εκει before ἰδου ωδε. 5 Mjj. omit η before ἰδου. ℵ. M., και ἰδου. Ver 24. All the Mjj., D. excepted, omit και after ἐσται. B. D. It[alliq.] omit εν τη ημερα αυτου.

is the subject of ver. 25. *This generation* can designate no other than the Jewish contemporaries of the Messiah. A separation is about to supervene between Israel and its now present Messiah. And this rejection of the Messiah by His own people will be the signal for the invisibility of His kingdom. Comp. the antithesis 13 : 35 (the faith of Israel bringing back the Messiah from heaven). How long will this abnormal state last? Jesus Himself knows not. But He declares that this epoch of His invisibility will terminate in an entirely materialistic state of things, vers. 26–30, which will be brought to an end suddenly by His advent.

Vers. 26–30.* "And as it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. 27. They did eat, they drank, they married, and were given in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark; and the flood came, and destroyed them all. 28. Likewise also, as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; 29. But the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. 30. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed." While believers sigh with growing ardor for the return of their Lord, carnal security more or less complete takes possession of the race. It is an epoch like those which have preceded all the great catastrophes of history. The business of earthly life is carried through with regularity; but religious feeling gradually disappears from the heart of men who have become secularized. The *days of Noe* denote the 120 years during which the ark was a-building. Ἐξεγαμίζοντο strictly means, *were given in marriage*, that is to say, young daughters by their parents. The finite verbs ἤσθιον, ἔπινον (ver. 28), ἔβρεξε (ver. 29), are in apposition to ἐγένετο, and, as such, are still dependent on ὡς. The apodosis does not occur till ver. 30. This form is analogous to the Hebrew construction which we have so often observed in Luke (ἐγένετο, with a finite verb for its subject). Ἔβρεξε is generally regarded as active: God *caused it to rain*. Comp. Gen. 19 : 24, καὶ κύριος ἔβρεξεν (Matt. 5 : 45). But as in this case the ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ would be pleonastic, and as Βρέχω is found in Polybius and the later Greek authors in a neuter sense, it is more natural to adopt this sense here, by which we at the same time preserve the parallelism between ἀπώλεσεν (subject, πῦρ καὶ θεῖον) and the ἀπώλεσεν, ver. 27 (subject, κατακλυσμός). The word ἀποκαλύπτεται supposes that Jesus is present, but that a veil conceals His person from the view of the world. All at once the veil is lifted, and the glorified Lord is visible to all. This term occurs again in the same sense, 1 Cor. 1 : 7; 2 Thess. 1 : 7; 1 Pet. 1 : 7; and perhaps 1 Cor. 3 : 13. The point of comparison between this event and the examples quoted is the surprise caused in the bosom of security. Matt. 24 : 37–39 contains a passage parallel to vers. 26, 27 (the example of Noe). The idea is the same; but the terms are so different that they forbid us to assume that the two editions proceed from the same text.

Vers. 31–37.† "In that day, he which shall be upon the housetop, and his stuff

* Ver. 27. The MSS. are divided between εξεγαμιζοντο (T. R.) and εγαμιζοντο (Alex.). Ver. 28. ℵ. B. L. R. X., καθως instead of και ως. Ver. 30. The MSS. are divided between κατα ταυτα (T. R.) and κατα τα αυτα.

† Ver. 32. B. L. It$^{aliq.}$, περιποιησασθαι instead of σωσαι. Ver. 33. ℵ. B. D. R. 3 Mnn. omit αυτην after απολεση or απολεσει. Ver. 34. All the Mjj., B. excepted, εις instead of ο εις. Ver. 35. ℵ* 1 Mn. omit this verse. Ver. 36. This verse is wanting in all the Mjj., D. U. excepted, in several Mnn. It^{plerique} (taken from Matthew). Ver. 37. E. G. H. 25 Mnn., πτωμα instead of σωμα. ℵ. B. L. U. Λ. 30 Mnn. add και after εκει. ℵ. B. L. Q., επισυναχθησονται instead of συναχθησονται.

in the house, let him not come down to take it away : and he that is in the field, let him likewise not return back. 32. Remember Lot's wife. 33. Whosoever shall seek to save his life, shall lose it ; and whosoever shall lose his life, shall preserve it. 34. I tell you, in that night there shall be two men in one bed ; the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left. 35. Two women shall be grinding together ; the one shall be taken, and the other left. 36, 37. And they answered and said unto Him, Where, Lord ? And He said unto them, Wheresoever the body is, thither will the eagles be gathered together." Here is the practical conclusion of the discourse. Jesus describes that disposition of mind which, in this last crisis, shall be the condition of salvation. The Lord passes with His heavenly retinue. He attracts all the inhabitants of the earth who are willing and ready to join Him ; but it transpires in the twinkling of an eye. Whoever is not already loosened from earthly things, so as to haste away without hesitation, taking flight toward Him freely and joyously, remains behind. Thus precisely had Lot's wife perished with the goods, from which she could not part. Agreeably to His habitual method, Jesus characterizes this disposition of mind by a series of external acts, in which it is concretely realized. The *Revue de Théologie* (passage quoted, p. 337) condemns Luke for here applying to the Parousia the counsel to flee, which has no meaning, except as applied to the destruction of Jerusalem (Matt. 24). This accusation is false, for there is no mention of *fleeing* from one part of the earth to another, but of rising from the earth to the Lord, as He passes and disappears : " Let him not come down (from the roof) ; but, forgetting *all that is in the house*, let him be ready to follow the Lord !" So he who is *in the fields* is not to attempt to return home to carry upward with him some object of value. The Lord is there ; if any one belongs to Him let him leave everything at once to accompany Him (Matt. 24 : 18 : the laborer should not even return to seek his dress, which he laid aside to work). This saying, especially in the form of Matthew, evidently referred to the Parousia, which shall come suddenly, and not to the destruction of Jerusalem, which will be preceded by an armed invasion and a long war.* Luke's context is therefore preferable to Matthew's. Ver. 23. *To save one's life*, by riveting it to some object with which it is identified, is the means of losing it, of being left behind with this perishing world ; *to give one's life*, by quitting everything at once, is the only means of saving it, by laying hold of the Lord who is passing. See on 9 : 24. Jesus here substitutes for the phrase *to save his life* the word ζωογονεῖν, literally, *to give it birth alive*. The word is that by which the LXX. express the Piel and Hiphil of חיה, *to live*. Here it is having the natural life born again, that it may be reproduced in the form of spiritual, glorified, eternal life. The absolute sacrifice of the natural life is the means of this transformation. Here is a word of unfathomable depth and of daily application.

At this time a selection will take place (ver. 34)—a selection which will instantaneously break all earthly relations, even the most intimate, and from which there will arise a new grouping of humanity in two new families or societies, the *taken* and the *left*. Λέγω ὑμῖν, *I tell you*, announces something weighty. Bleek thinks, that as the subject under discussion is the return of the Lord as *judge*, to be taken is to perish, to be left is to escape. But the *middle* παραλαμβάνεσθαι, *to take to one's self*, to

* Our author here speaks with a confidence not shared by the bulk of commentators, and puts a force into the reference to " the stuff," which is not necessarily in it. The destruction of Jerusalem foreshadows features of the judgment, and is not overlooked.—J. H.

welcome as one's own, can only have a favorable meaning (John 14 : 3). And St. Paul certainly understood the word in this sense ; for it is probably not without relation to this saying that he teaches, 1 Thess. 4 : 17, the taking up into the air of the believers who are alive at the return of Christ ; it is the ascension of the disciples, as the complement of their Master's. Ἀφιέναι, *to forsake*, to leave behind, as 13 : 35. The image of ver. 34 supposes that the Parousia takes place at night. Ver. 35, on the contrary, supposes it happening during the day. It matters little. For one hemisphere it will be in the day ; for the other, at night. The idea remains the same : whether he is sleeping, or whether he is working, man ought to be sufficiently disengaged to give himself over without delay to the Lord who draws him. Hand-mills were used among the ancients. When the millstone was large, two persons turned it together. Ver. 36, which is wanting in almost all the Mjj., is taken from the parallel passage in Matthew. Thus the beings who shall have been most closely connected here below, shall, in the twinkling of an eye, be parted forever.

The apostle's question (ver. 37) is one of curiosity. Although Jesus had already answered it in ver. 24, He takes advantage of it to close the conversation by a declaration which applies it to the whole world. The natural phenomenon, described by Job 39 : 30, is used by Jesus to symbolize the universality of the judgment proclaimed. The carcass is humanity entirely secular, and destitute of the life of God (vers. 26–30 ; comp. 9 : 60, *Let the dead* . . .). The eagles represent punishment alighting on such a society. There is no allusion in this figure to the Roman standards, for there is no reference in the preceding discourse to the destruction of Jerusalem. Comp. also Matt. 24 : 28, where this saying applies exclusively to the Parousia. The eagle, properly so called, does not live in flocks, it is true, and does not feed on carrion. But ἀετός, as well as נֶשֶׁר, Prov. 30 : 17, may (as Furrer shows, "Bedeut. der Bibl. Geogr." p. 13) denote the great vulture (*gyps fulvus*), equal to the eagle in size and strength, which is seen in hundreds on the plain of Gennesareth. Some Fathers have applied the image of the body to Jesus glorified, and that of the eagles to the saints who shall accompany Him at His advent !

3d. 18 : 1–8.* *The Widow and the Unjust Judge.*—This parable is peculiar to Luke. The formula ἔλεγε δὲ καί, "furthermore, hear this also," announces it as the conclusion of the whole discourse 17 : 20, *et seq.* Weizsäcker (p. 139) and Holtzmann (p. 132) think that the introduction, ver. 1, gives this parable a commonplace application (the duty of perseverance in prayer), which does not belong to the original idea of this discourse (the imminence of the Parousia). But is there not a very close correspondence between the duty of persevering prayer, and the danger which the Church runs of being overcome by the carnal slumber which has just been described in the preceding portraiture ? The Son of man has been rejected ; He has gone from view ; the masses are plunged in gross worldliness ; men of God are become as rare as in Sodom. What is, then, the position of the Church ? That of a widow whose only weapon is incessant prayer. It is only by means of this intense concentration that faith will be preserved. But such is precisely the disposition which, Jesus fears,

* Ver. 1. ℵ. B. L. M. several Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ omit *και* after *δε*. 15 Mjj. 60 Mnn. add *αυτους* after *προσευχεσθαι*. The mss. are divided between *εκκακειν* and *εγκακειν*. Ver. 3. The Mjj., A. excepted, omit *τις* after *δε*. Ver. 4. The mss. are divided between *ηθελησεν* (T. R.) and *ηθελεν* (Alex.). ℵ. B. L. X. It^{plerique}, *ουδε ανθρωπον* instead of *και ανθρωπον ουκ*. Ver. 7. ℵ. B. L. Q., *αυτω* instead of *προς αυτον*. ℵ. A. B. D. L. Q. X. Π. 3 Mnn., *μακροθυμει* instead of *μακροθυμων*.

P. J. LIBRARY K. C. K.

may not be found even in the Church at His return. The parable is therefore placed here most appropriately, and the introduction is in perfect keeping with its first intention. Comp. 21 : 34–36, where we find the same ideas in correspondence—the danger of being spiritually overcharged in the last times, and the duty of unceasing vigilance and prayer. Ἐκκακεῖν, *to relax*, to let go, not to hold determinedly to one's rights, like the widow.

There lies at the foundation of this parable, as in those of the indiscreet friend and the lost sheep (11 and 15), an argument *à fortiori* : "Were God like this judge, He would not resist the Church's believing prayer ; how much less, being what He is !" The condition of the Church after the Lord's departure is like that of a *widow*, and of a widow deprived of her rights. The Lord has acquired for His own glorious prerogatives, which have not yet passed into the domain of facts, and the enjoyment of which, if they esteem them at their just value, they should claim without ceasing. Ἐκδικεῖν (ver. 3) ; to deliver (ἐκ) by a judicial sentence (δίκη). This term does not therefore include the notion of vengeance, but that of justice to be rendered to the oppressed. If ὑπωπιάζειν, *to disfigure the face*, be taken in the weakened sense of *importuning*, it will be necessary to understand εἰς τέλος, *to the end* : "Lest she importune me to the end (indefinitely)." But Meyer prefers keeping the strict sense, both of the verb and of εἰς τέλος (at last) : "Lest she come at last to strike me." The participle ἐρχομένη, *coming to me*, decides in favor of this second meaning. There is in this saying a touch of pleasantry. Ver 6. "*Hear* : for there is a lesson to be drawn even from this impious language." Ver. 7. *The continual crying* of the elect recalls the ardent desire of believers to see one of the days of the Son of man, 17 : 22. The *elect* are those whom God has drawn by the calling of Jesus from the bosom of lost humanity, agreeably to the eternal plan of salvation. If we read μακροθυμεῖ (Alex.), we must give this proposition the interrogative meaning : "Will He not do right . . . and *will He be slow* in their behalf, that is to say, to punish those who oppress them ?" But the sense which must thus be given to ἐπ' αὐτοῖς is not natural. It is much better, therefore, to read : μακροθυμῶν, the meaning of which is (with καί) : "Though He restrain His anger on account of His [oppressed] elect." God suffers with them (Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me ?) ; and therefore Jesus can say of God, that He *restrains Himself on their account*. If, then, He does not interpose immediately to deliver them, it is not from indifference ; it is from long-suffering to their oppressors. Comp. 2 Pet. 3 : 9. It is nowhere said that the *object* of the unceasing cry of the elect is the punishment of their adversaries, which would not be in keeping with the figure of the parable ; it is their own deliverance, by their being put in possession of the heritage to which they are entitled. But God, it is true, cannot grant this petition without breaking the power of those who stand in the way of this act of justice. It is to this aspect of His answer that allusion is made by the μακροθυμεῖν.

Ἐν τάχει, *speedily*, does not at all mean that the limit of divine forbearance is near, which would be inconsistent with the long interval of time announced in the words, *days will come* . . . (17 : 22). The word rather signifies, that the hearing once given, the deliverance will be accomplished with small delay, in the twinkling of an eye ; comp. Rom. 16 : 20 (where, too, we should translate not shortly, but very quickly). Πλήν : "I am not afraid of the Judge failing in His duty. The only thing which makes me anxious is this, lest the widow fail in hers." Τὴν πίστιν : not *some faith* in general, but *the faith*—that special faith of which the widow's is an image,

which, in spite of the judge's obstinate silence and long apparent indifference, perseveres in claiming its right. *On the earth*, in opposition to the Son of man who comes again from heaven. We must here remember the sad picture of the state of humanity at this epoch (17 : 26–30). Is it not to such a state of things that Jesus also makes allusion, Matt. 25 : 5 : "And they all slumbered and slept"?

Hilgenfeld and others find in this parable a thirst for vengeance, which corresponds rather with the furious zeal of the Apocalypse than the true Pauline feeling of Luke. This passage must therefore be "one of those most ancient parts of our Gospel" which Luke borrowed from a Jewish document. Others, like De Wette, see in it, on the contrary, the traces of a later period, when the Church had become the victim of persecution. But, 1. This alleged thirst for vengeance nowhere appears in the text. 2. Our passage is full of gentleness in comparison with expressions of indignation used by Paul himself (Rom. 2 : 4, 5, 8, 9 ; 1 Thess. 3 : 15, 16 ; 2 Thess. 1 : 8). The spirit of this parable is therefore not in the least opposed to that of the Pauline Luke. 3. There is allusion, no doubt, to the abnormal position of the Church between Christ's departure and His return, but not to persecution strictly so called.

While Hilgenfeld affects to distinguish in this piece the originally Ebionite passages (17 : 1-4, 11–19 ; 18 : 1–8) from those which are of Luke's composition (17 ; 5–10, 20–37 ; 18 : 1–14), Volkmar ("Evangel. Marcions," p. 203) maintains that the arrangement of the piece is systematic, and rests on the well-known Pauline triad : *love* (17 : 1–4), *faith* (vers. 5–19), *hope* (ver. 30, *et seq.*). But it is easy to see how forced it is to apply any such scheme to those different accounts.

3. *The Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican :* 18 : 9–14.—Vers. 9–14.* This parable is peculiar to Luke. Who are those τινές, *certain*, to whom it is addressed? They cannot be Pharisees. Luke would have named them, as at 16 : 14 ; and Jesus would not have presented to them as an example, in a parable, one of themselves, while designating him expressly in this character. Bleek thinks that they were disciples of Jesus. But Luke would have equally designated them (16 : 1). They were therefore probably members of the company following Jesus, who had not yet openly declared for Him, and who manifested a haughty distance to certain sinners, known to be such, who were in the company with them ; comp. 19 : 7. The word σταθείς, *standing erect* (ver. 11), indicates a posture of assurance, and even boldness (comp. *standing afar off*, ver. 13). Πρὸς ἑαυτόν does not depend on σταθείς : "standing *aside*, at a distance, from the vulgar"—it would have required καθ' ἑαυτόν (Meyer)—but on προσηύχετο : "he prayed, speaking thus to himself . . ." It was less a prayer in which he gave thanks to God, than a congratulation which he addressed to himself. True thanksgiving is always accompanied by a feeling of humiliation. The Pharisees fasted on the Monday and Thursday of every week. Κτᾶσθαι denotes the act of acquiring rather than that of possessing ; it therefore refers here to the produce of the fields (11 : 42). To strike the breast : an emblem of the stroke of death which the sinner feels that he has merited at the hand of God. The *heart* is struck, as the seat of personal life and of sin. Λέγω ὑμῖν (ver. 14) : "I tell you, strange as it may appear . . ." The idea of *justification*, that is to say, of a righteousness bestowed on the sinner by a divine sentence, belongs even to the O. T. Comp. Gen. 15 : 6 ; Isa. 1 : 8, 53 : 11. In the received reading ἢ ἐκεῖνος, ἤ is governed by μᾶλλον,

* Ver. 9. The MSS. are divided between ειπεν and ειπεν δε και. Ver. 11. ℵ. Hierlerique, omit προς εαυτον. Ver. 12. ℵ. B., αποδεκατευω instead of αποδεκατω. Ver. 13. ℵ. B. G. L. 5 Mnn. Syr^{cur}., ο δε τελωνης instead of και ο τελωνης. 8 Mjj. 15 Mnn. It. Vg. omit εις before το στηθος. Ver. 14. Instead of η εκεινος (T. R. with some Mnn.), 16 Mjj. and 150 Mnn. read η γαρ εκεινος, and ℵ. B. L., παρ' εκεινον.

rather, understood. The suppression of the adverb *rather* serves to prevent the idea that the Pharisee also received his share of justification. In the reading ἢ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος (more strongly supported than the others), ἤ is explained in the same way, and γάρ has as is often the case an interrogative value: "For think you that he (the Pharisee) could be justified?" This somewhat difficult turn of expression has occasioned the Alex. correction παρ' ἐκεῖνον. Our Lord loves to close His parables with axioms formally expressing the fundamental laws of moral life: God will overthrow all self-exaltation; but He will turn in love to all sincere humiliation.

Undoubtedly if Luke's object was to point out in the ministry of Jesus the historical foundations for St. Paul's teaching, this piece corresponds most exactly to his intention. But no argument can be drawn therefrom contrary to the truth of the narrative. For the idea of justification *by faith* is one of the axioms not only of the teaching of Jesus, but of that of the O. T. (comp. besides the passages quoted, Hab. 2 : 4).

4. *The Children brought to Jesus:* 18 : 15–17.—Vers. 15–17.* It is here that Luke's narrative rejoins Matthew's (19 : 14) and Mark's (10 : 13), after having diverged from them at 9 : 51. Jesus is in Perea. Of his sojourn in this province Matthew and Mark have as yet related only one fact—the conversation with the Pharisees regarding divorce, summarily reproduced by Luke 16 : 13–19.

By the phrase: even infants (καὶ τά . . .), ver. 15, Luke would indicate that the consideration enjoyed by Jesus had reached its height. Mothers brought him even their nurslings. The article before βρέφη denotes the category. The apostles think that this is to abuse the goodness and time of their Master. Mark, who likes to depict moral impressions, describes the indignation felt by Jesus (ἠγανάκτησε) on perceiving this feeling. Luke is less severe—the evangelist who is accused of abusing the Twelve. After calling back those little ones who were being sent away (αὐτά) Jesus instructs His disciples in respect of them. Matthew, as usual, summarizes. There is in children a twofold receptivity, negative and positive, humility and confidence. By labor expended on ourselves, we are to return to those dispositions which are natural to the child. The pronoun τῶν τοιούτων, *of such*, does not refer to other children, such as those present, but to all those who voluntarily put on the dispositions indicated. Jesus, according to Mark, clasped those children tenderly in His arms, and put his hands on them, blessing them. Matthew speaks only of the imposition of hands. These touching details are omitted by Luke. For what reason, if he knew them? They agreed so well with the spirit of his Gospel! Volkmar ("Die Evangel." p. 487) explains this omission by the prosaic character of Luke (!). According to the same author, these little children represent the Gentiles saved by grace. Party dogmatics, even in this the simplest narrative of the Gospel!

5. *The Rich Young Man:* vers. 18–30.—In the three Syn. this piece immediately follows the preceding (Matt. 19 : 16; Mark 10 : 17). Oral tradition had connected the two, perhaps because there existed between them a real chronological succession. Three parts: 1*st*. The conversation with the young man (vers. 18–23); 2*d*. The conversation which takes place in regard to him (vers. 24–27); 3*d*. The conversation of Jesus with the disciples regarding themselves (vers. 28–30).

* Ver. 15. ℵ. B. D. G. L. some Mnn., επετιμων instead of επετιμησαν. Ver. 16. ℵ. B. D. G. L. 4 Mnn. Syr$^{sch.}$, προσεκαλεσατο (or . . . λειτο) αυτα λεγων instead of προσκαλεσαμενος αυτα ειπεν.

1*st.* Vers. 18–23.* *The Rich Young Man.*—Luke gives this man the title ἄρχων, *chief*, which probably signifies here, president of the synagogue. Matthew and Mark simply say εἷς. Later, Matthew calls him a young man (ver. 20). His arrival is given with dramatic effect by Mark : *He came running, and kneeled down before Him.* He sincerely desired salvation, and he imagined that some generous action, some great sacrifice, would secure this highest good ; and this hope supposes that man has power of himself to do good ; that therefore he is radically good. This is what is implied in his apostrophe to Jesus : good master ; for it is the man in Him whom he thus salutes, knowing Him as yet in no other character. Jesus, by refusing this title in the false sense in which it is given Him, does not accuse Himself of sin, as has been alleged. If He had had a conscience burdened with some trespass, He would have avowed it explicitly. But Jesus reminds him that all goodness in man, as in every creature whatsoever, must flow from God. This axiom is the very foundation of Monotheism. Thereby He strikes directly at the young man's fundamental error. So far as Jesus is concerned, the question of His personal goodness depends solely on the consideration whether His inward dependence on that God, the only good, is complete or partial. If it is complete, Jesus is good, but with a goodness which is that of God Himself operating in Him. His answer does not touch this personal side of the question. In Matthew, at least according to the Alex. reading, which is probably the true one, the word good is omitted in the young man's address, and the answer of Jesus is conceived in these terms : "Why askest thou me about what is good? One only is good." Which may signify : "Good is being joined to God, the only good ;" or : "Good is fulfilling the commandments of God, the only good Being." These two explanations are both unnatural. Even Bleek does not hesitate here to prefer the form of Luke and Mark. That of Matthew is perhaps a modification arising from the fear of inferences hostile to the purity of Jesus, which might be drawn from the form of His answer, as it has been transmitted to us by the two other Syn.

Jesus has just rectified the young man's radical mistake. Now He replies to his question. The work to be done is to love. Jesus quotes the second table, as bearing on works of a more external and palpable kind, and consequently more like one of those which the young man expected to be mentioned. This answer of Jesus is earnest ; for to love is to live ! (See at 10 : 28) The only question is how we can attain to it. But Jesus proceeds like a wise instructor. Far from arresting on their way those who believe in their own strength, He encourages them to prosecute it faithfully to the very end, knowing well that if they are sincere they shall *by the law* die *to the law* (Gal. 2 : 19). As Gess says : "To take the law in thorough earnest is the true way to come to Jesus Christ." The young man's reply (ver. 21) testifies, undoubtedly, great moral ignorance, but also noble sincerity. He knows not the spiritual meaning of the commandments, and thinks that he has really fulfilled them. Here occurs the inimitable stroke of Mark's pencil : "And Jesus, beholding him, loved him." When critics wish to make out Mark to be the compiler of the two other evangelists, they are obliged to say, with De Wette, that Mark himself, inventing this amiable

* Ver. 20. 10 Mjj. 25 Mnn. It$^{\text{aliq}}$. Vg. omit σου after μητερα. Ver. 21. ℵ. A. B. L. 2 Mnn., εφυλαξα instead of εφυλαξαμην. Ver. 22. ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn. Syr. omit ταυτα after ακηκοας δε. ℵ. F. H. V. several Mnn., οτι instead of ετι. The MSS. are divided between διαδος and δος (taken from the parallels), and between ουρανω (T. R.) and ουρανοις (Alex.). Ver. 23. ℵ. B. L., εγενηθη instead of εγενετο.

answer, has ascribed to Jesus his own feelings. We see much rather in this saying, one of those strokes which reveal the source whence the narratives of Mark proceed, and which must have been one very near the person of Jesus. It was an apostle who was following the impressions of Jesus as they depicted themselves in His countenance, and who caught as it passed the look of tenderness which He cast on this person so sincere and so innocent. This look of love was also a scrutinizing look (ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ, Mark 5 : 21), by which Jesus discerned the good and bad qualities of the heart, and which dictated to Him the following saying. The δέ, with ἀκούσας (ver. 22), is adversative and progressive. It announces a new resolution taken by the Lord. He determines to call this man into the number of His permanent disciples. The real substance of His answer, indeed, is not the order to distribute his goods, but the call to follow Him. The giving away of his money is only the condition of entering upon that new career which is open to him (see at 10 : 61, 12 : 33). In the proposal which He makes to him, Jesus observes the character which best corresponds to the desire expressed by the young man. He asked of Him some work to do ; and Jesus points out one, and that decisive, which perfectly corresponds to his object, inasmuch as it assures him of salvation. To disengage one's self from everything in order to follow Jesus conclusively—such is really salvation, life. The formal correspondence of this answer to the young man's thought appears in the expression, *One thing thou lackest* (Luke and Mark) ; and more clearly still in that of Matthew, *If thou wilt be perfect, go . . .* Undoubtedly, according to the view of Jesus, man cannot do more or better than fulfil the law (Matt. 5 : 17, 48). Only the law must be understood not in the letter, but in the spirit (Matt. 5). The perfection to which Jesus calls the young man is not the fulfilling of a law *superior* to the law strictly so called, but the real fulfilling, in opposition to that external, literal fulfilling whi h the young man already had (ver. 21). This one thing which he lacks is the spirit of the law, that is, love ready to give everything : this is the whole of the law (Luke 6). The words, *Thou shalt have treasure in heaven*, do not signify that this almsgiving will open heaven to him, but that, when he shall have entered into this abode, he will find there, as the result of his sacrifice, grateful beings, whose love shall be to him an inexhaustible treasure (see at 16 : 9). The act, which is the real condition of entering heaven, is indicated by the last word, to which the whole converges, *Follow me.* The mode of following Jesus varies according to times At that time, in order to be inwardly attached to Him, it was necessary for a man to follow Him externally, and consequently to abandon his earthly position. At the present day, when Jesus lives no more in the body here below, the only condition is the spiritual one, but with all those moral conditions which flow from our relation to Him, according to each one's character and place. The sorrow which this answer occasions the young man is expressed by Mark in the most dramatic way : *He heaved a deep sigh* (στυγνάσας). The Gospel of the Hebrews thus described this scene : "Then the rich man began to scratch his head, for that was not to his mind. And the Lord said to him : How, then, canst thou say, I have kept the law ; for it is written in the law, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself ; and lo ! many of thy brethren, children of Abraham, live in the gutter, and die of hunger, while thy table is loaded with good things, and nothing is sent out to them ?"* Such is the writing which some modern critics (*e.g.* Baur) allege to be the original of our Matthew, and the parent of our synoptical literature !

* Quoted by Origen, in Matt. 19 : 19.

2*d.* Vers. 24–27.* *The Conversation regarding the Rich Man.*—It is not the fact of proprietorship which hinders the soul from taking its flight to spiritual blessings; it is the feeling of security which it inspires. So, in Mark, Jesus says, in explanation of His first declaration: "How hard is it for *them that trust* in riches to enter . . .!" The Shemites denote the impossibility of a thing by the image of a heavily laden camel arriving at a city gate which is low and narrow, and through which it cannot pass. Then, to give this image the piquant form which the Oriental proverb loves, this gate is transformed into the eye of a needle. Some commentators and copyists, not understanding this figure, have changed κάμηλος, *camel*, into κάμιλος (the η was pronounced *i*), a very unusual word, which does not occur even in the ancient lexicographers, and which, it is alleged, sometimes denotes a ship's cable. In the received text (τρυμαλιᾶς ῥαφίδος), ῥαφιδος is a correction borrowed from Mark and Matthew; the true reading in Luke is βελόνης, which also signifies *needle*. Instead of the word τρυμαλία, the Alex. read τρύπημα (or τρῆμα). The first form might come from Mark; but it is more probable that it is the second which is taken from Matthew, the Gospel most generally used. We must therefore read in Luke, τρυμαλιᾶς βελόνης.

To exclude the rich from salvation was, it seemed, to exclude all; for if the most blessed among men can only be saved with difficulty, what will become of the rest? Such appears to be the connection between vers. 25 and 26. De Wette joins them in a somewhat different way: "As every one more or less seeks riches, none therefore can be saved." This connection is less natural. Jesus, according to Matthew and Mark, at this point turns on His disciples a look full of earnestness (ἐμβλέψας αὐτοις, *looking upon them*): "It is but too true; but there is a sphere in which the impossible is possible, that of the divine operation (παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, *with God.*)" Thus Jesus in the twinkling of an eye lifts the mind of His hearers from human works, of which alone the young man was thinking, to that divine work of radical regeneration which proceeds from the One only good, and of which Jesus is alone the instrument. Comp. a similar and equally rapid gradation of ideas, John 3 : 2, 5. Which would have been better for this young man—to leave his goods to become the companion in labor of the St. Peters and St. Johns, or to keep those possessions so soon to be laid waste by the Roman legions?

3*d.* Vers. 28–30.† *The Conversation regarding the Disciples.*—There had been a day in the life of the disciples when a similar alternative had been put before them; they had resolved it in a different way. What was to accrue to them from the course which they had taken? Peter asks the question innocently, in the name of all. The form of his inquiry in Matthew, *What shall we have therefore?* contains, more expressly than that of Luke and Mark, the idea of an expected recompense. In Matthew, the Lord enters at once into Peter's thought, and makes a special promise to the Twelve, one of the grandest which He addressed to them. Then, in the parable of the laborers, He warns them against indulging pride, on the ground that they have been the first to follow Him. It is difficult fully to harmonize this parable with the special promise

* Ver. 24. ℵ. B. L. 4 Mnn. omit περὶ παντων γενομενον. B. L., εισπορευονται instead of εισελευσονται. Ver. 25. ℵ. 7 Mnn., καμιλον instead of καμηλου. ℵ. B. D. τρηματος, L. R. τρυπηματος, instead of τρυμαλιας. ℵ. B. D. L. 8 Mnn., βελονης instead of ραφιδος. A. D. M. P. 20 Mnn. Syr^{cur}. It^{plerique}, Vg., διελθειν instead of εισελθειν.

† Ver. 28. ℵ^{c} B. D. L. some Mnn. It^{plerique}, αφεντες ιδια instead of αφηκαμεν παντα και. Ver. 30. ℵ. B. L. 3 Mnn., ος ουχι instead of ος ου. B. D. M. 10 Mnn., λαβη instead of απολαβῃ.

which precedes it, without holding that the promise was conditional, and was not to be fulfilled, except in so far as they did not abandon themselves to the spirit of pride combated in the parable, which savors of refinement. As, therefore, Luke places this same promise in a wholly different setting, 22 : 28–30, a context with which it perfectly agrees, it is probable that Matthew placed it here through an association of ideas which admits of easy explanation. According to Luke and Mark, the promise by which Jesus answered Peter is such as to apply to all believers ; and it behoved to be so, if Jesus did not wish to favor the feeling of self-exaltation which breathed in the question of the apostle. There is even in the form, *There is no man that . . .* (Mark and Luke), the express intention to give to this promise the widest possible application. All the relations of natural life find their analogies in the bonds formed by community of faith. Hence there arises for the believer a compensation for the painful rupture of fleshly ties, which Jesus knew so well by experience (8 : 19–21 ; comp. with 8 : 1–3) ; and every true believer can, like Him, speak of fathers and mothers, brethren and children, who form his new spiritual family. Luke and Mark speak, besides, of *houses ;* Matthew, of *lands.* The communion of Christian love in reality procures for each believer the enjoyment of every sort of good belonging to his brethren ; yet, to prevent His disciples from supposing that it is an earthly paradise to which He is inviting them, He adds in Mark, *with persecutions.* Matthew and Luke had assuredly no dogmatic reason for omitting this important correction, if they had known it. Luke likewise omits here the maxim, " Many that are first shall be last, etc. . . ." with which this piece closes in Mark, and which in Matthew introduces the parable of the laborers.

The common source of the three Syn. cannot be the proto-Mark, as Holtzmann will have it, unless we hold it to be at their own hand that Luke ascribes to this rich man the title, ruler of the synagogue, and that Matthew calls him a young man. As to Luke's Ebionite tendency, criticism is bound to acknowledge, with this piece before it, that if salvation by voluntary poverty is really taught in our Gospel, it is not less decidedly so by the other two Syn. that it is a heresy, consequently, not of Luke, but of Jesus—or rather, a sound exegesis can find no such thing in the doctrines which our three evangelists agree in putting in the Master's mouth.

6. *The Third Announcement of the Passion :* 18 : 31–34.—Vers. 31–34. Twice already Jesus had announced to His disciples His approaching sufferings (9 : 18, *et seq.*, 43, *et seq.*) ; yet, as proved by the request of the two sons of Zebedee (Matt. 20 : 20 ; Mark 10 : 35), their hopes constantly turned toward an earthly kingdom. In renewing the announcement of His Passion, Jesus labors to abate the offence which this event will occasion, and even to convert it into a support for their faith, when at a later date they shall compare this catastrophe with the sayings by which He prepared them for it (John 13 : 19). Mark prefaces this third announcement by a remarkable introduction (10 : 32). Jesus walks before them on the road ; they follow, astonished and alarmed. This picture reminds us of the expression, *He set His face steadfastly* (Luke 9 : 51), as well as of the sayings of the disciples and of Thomas (John 11 : 8, 16). What substantial harmony under this diversity of form ! In general, Luke does not quote prophecies ; he does so here once for all, and, as it were, in the mass The dative, *τῷ υἱῷ*, may be made dependent on *γεγραμμένα*, " written for the Son of man," as the sketch of His course ; or *τελεσθήσεται*, " shall be accomplished in respect to the Son of man," in His person. The first construction is simpler. The form of the fut. passive used by Luke denotes passive abandonment to suffering more forcibly than the active futures used by Matthew and Mark. The

kind of death is not indicated in Luke and Mark so positively as in Matthew (σταυρῶσαι); nevertheless the details in this third announcement are more precise and more dramatic than in the preceding. See at 9 : 45. On ver. 34 Riggenbach justly observes: "Toward everything which is contrary to natural desire, there is produced in the heart a blindness which nothing but a miracle can heal."

As ver. 34 has no parallel in the other two Syn., Holtzmann thinks that Luke makes this reflection a substitute for the account of the request preferred by Zebedee's sons, which is found here in the narratives of Matthew and Mark. But does not a perfectly similar reflection occur in the sequel of the second announcement of the Passion (9 : 45), where no such intention is admissible? It is difficult for those who regard Luke's Gospel as systematically hostile to the Twelve, to explain the omission of a fact so unfavorable to two of the leading apostles. Volkmar ("Die Evangel." p. 501) has found the solution: Luke wishes to avoid offending the Judeo-Christian party, which he desires to gain over to Paulinism! So, artful in what he says, more artful in his silence—such is Luke in the estimate of this school of criticism!

7. *The Healing of Bartimeus:* 18 : 35–43.—John's very exact narrative serves to complete the synoptical account. The sojourn of Jesus in Perea was interrupted by the call which led Jesus to Bethany to the help of Lazarus (John 11). Thence He proceeds to Ephraim, on the Samaritan side, where He remained in retirement with His disciples (John 11 : 54). It was doubtless at this time that the third announcement of His Passion took place. On the approach of the feast of Passover, He went down the valley of the Jordan, rejoining at Jericho the Galilean caravans which arrived by way of Perea. He had resolved this time to enter Jerusalem with the greatest publicity, and to present Himself to the people and to the Sanhedrim in the character of a king. It was *His hour*, the hour of His manifestation, expected long ago by Mary (John 2 : 4), and which His brethren (John 7 : 6–8) had thought to precipitate.

Vers. 35–43.* Luke speaks of a blind man sitting by the wayside, whom Jesus cured as He *came nigh* to Jericho; Mark gives this man's name, *Bartimeus;* according to his account, it was as Jesus *went out* of Jericho that He healed him; finally, Matthew speaks of *two* blind men, who were healed as Jesus *departed* from the city. The three accounts harmonize, as in so many cases, only in the words of the dialogue; the tenor of the sufferer's prayer and of the reply of Jesus is almost identical in the three (ver. 38 and parallel). Of those three narratives, that of Mark is undoubtedly the most exact and picturesque; and in the case of a real difference, it is to this evangelist that we must give the preference. It has been observed, however (Andreæ *Beweis des Glaubens*, July and August, 1870), that Josephus and Eusebius distinguished between the old and the new Jericho, and that the two blind men might have been found, the one as they went out of the one city, the other at the entrance of the other. Or, indeed, it is not impossible that two cures took place on that day, the one on the occasion of their entrance into the city, the other on their leaving it, which Matthew has combined; Luke applying to the one, following a tradition slightly altered, the special details which had characterized the other. This double modification might have been the more easily introduced into the oral narrative, if Jesus, coming from Ephraim to Jericho, entered the city, as is very probable, by the same road and by the same gate by which He left it to go to Jerusalem. If there were

* Ver. 35. ℵ. B. D. L., επαιτων instead of προσαιτων. Ver. 38. A. E. K. Π. 10 Mnn. omit Ιησου. Ver. 39. B. D. L. P. X. some Mnn., σιγηση instead of σιωπησε. Ver. 41. ℵ. B. D. L. X. omit λεγων before τι.

two blind men, they might then have been healed almost on the same spot. The name *Bartimeus* (*son of Timeus*), which Mark has preserved, comes either from the Greek name Τιμαῖος, *the honorable*, or from the Aramaic, *same*, *samia*, *blind;* blind, son of the blind (Hitzig, Keim). Mark adds: *the blind man.* The term suggests the name by which he was known in the place.

The address, *son of David*, is a form of undisguised Messianic worship. This utterance would suffice to show the state of men's minds at that time. The rebuke addressed to him by the members of the company (ver. 39) has no bearing whatever on the use of this title. It seems to them much rather that there is presumption on the part of a beggar in thus stopping the progress of so exalted a personage. The reading of the T. R., σιωπήσῃ, is probably taken from the parallels. We must read, with the Alex.: σιγήσῃ (a term more rarely used). Nothing could be more natural than the sudden change which is effected in the conduct of the multitude, as soon as they observe the favorable disposition of Jesus; they form so many inimitable characteristics preserved by Mark only. With a majesty truly royal, Jesus seems to open up to the beggar the treasures of divine power: "What wilt thou that I shall do unto thee?" and to give him, if we may so speak, *carte blanche* (5 : 41).

In replying to the blind man's prayer, ver. 42, He says, *thy faith*, not, *my power*, to impress on him the value of that disposition, in view of the still more important spiritual miracle which remains to be wrought in him, and, *hath saved thee*, not, *hath made thee whole;* although his life was in no danger, to show him that in this cure there lies the beginning of his salvation, if he will keep up the bond of faith between him and the Saviour's person. Jesus allows Bartimeus to give full scope to his gratitude, and the crowd to express aloud their admiration and joy. The time for cautious measures is past. Those feelings to which the multitude give themselves up are the breath preceding that anticipation of Pentecost which is called Palm Day. Δοξάζειν relates to the power, αἰνεῖν to the goodness of God (2 : 20).

The undeniable superiority of Mark's narrative obliges Bleek to give up here, at least in part, his untenable position of regarding Mark as the compiler of the two others. He acknowledges, that even while using the narrative of the other two, he must have had in this case a separate and independent source. So far well; but is it possible that this source absolutely contained nothing more than this one narrative?

Holtzmann, on the other hand, who regards the proto-Mark as the origin of the three Syn., finds it no less impossible to explain how Matthew and Luke could so completely alter the historical side of the account (the one: two blind men instead of one; the other: the healing before entering Jericho rather than after, etc.), and to spoil at will its dramatic beauty, so well reproduced by Mark. And what signifies the explanation given by Holtzmann of Luke's transposition of the miracle, and which is borrowed from Bleek: that Luke has been led by the succeeding history of Zaccheus to place the healing before the entrance into Jericho!

Volkmar, who derives Luke from Mark, and Matthew from the two combined, alleges that Mark intended the blind man to be the type of the Gentiles who seek the Saviour (hence the name Bartimeus; Timeus comes, according to him, from *Thima*, *the unclean*); and the company who followed Him, and who wish to impose silence on the man, to be types of the Judeo Christians, who denied to the Gentiles access to the Messiah of Israel. If Luke omits the most picturesque details, it is because of his prosaic character. If he omits the name Bartimeus, it is because he is offended at finding the Gentiles designated as impure beings. If he places the miracle before entering Jericho, it is because he distinguishes the healing of the man from that of his Paganism, which shall be placed after, and that in the salvation granted to

Zaccheus.* Zaccheus, the pure, is the counterpart of Timeus, *the unclean* ("Die Evangel." pp. 502–505). Of its kind this is the climax! Such is the game of hide and seek which the evangelists played with the Churches on the theme of the person of Jesus! After this we need give no other proofs of this author's sagacity.

8. *Jesus at the House of Zaccheus:* 19 : 1–10.—Vers. 1–10.† In Matthew and Mark the account of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem immediately follows that of the healing of Bartimeus. There is a blank left by them, for Jesus stayed at Bethany, and there passed at least one night (John 12 : 1, *et seq.*). This blank, according to Luke, is still more considerable. For before arriving at Bethany, Jesus stopped at Jericho, and there passed the night (ver. 5). Luke's source is original, and independent of the other two Syn. It was Aramaic, as is proved by the heaping up of καί, the paratactic form, as well as the expression ὀνόματι καλούμενος, vers. 1, 2. Comp. 1 : 61. The name Zaccheus, from זכך, *to be pure*, proves the Jewish origin of the man. There must have been at Jericho one of the principal custom-houses, both on account of the exportation of the balm which grew in that oasis, and which was sold in all countries of the world, and on account of the considerable traffic which took place on this road, by which lay the route from Perea to Judea and Egypt. Zaccheus was at the head of the office. The person of Jesus attracted his peculiar interest, no doubt because he had heard tell of the benevolence shown by this prophet to people of his class. Most certainly τίς ἐστί (ver. 3) does not signify . *which* of the members of the company He was (Bleek), but : what was His appearance. After having accompanied the crowd for a little, without gaining his end, he outruns it.

The sycamore is a tree with low horizontal branches, and consequently of easy ascent. Ἐκείνης, for : δι' ἐκείνης ὁδοῦ (ver. 19). Was the attention of Jesus called to his presence in the tree by the looks which the people directed toward him? Did He, at the same time, hear His name pronounced in the crowd? In this case, it is unnecessary to regard the address of Jesus as the effect of supernatural knowledge. There is something of pleasantness, and even of sprightliness, in the form : "Make haste and come down ; for to-day I must abide at thy house." The word *must* indicates that Jesus has recognized in him, on account of this eager desire which he has to see him, the host whom His Father has chosen for Him at Jericho. Here there is a lost sheep to be found. It is the same unwearied conviction of His mission as in meeting with the Samaritan woman. What absolute consecration to the divine work! And what sovereign independence of human opinion! In the multitude, which is yet swayed by pharisaic prejudices, there is general discontent. There is nothing to show that the disciples are also included under the words : "They all murmured." The expression σταθεὶς δέ, "but Zaccheus standing" (before the Lord, ver. 8), immediately connects the following words of the publican with those popular murmurs.

* It might be thought that we are jesting. Here are the words : "The blind mendicant of Mark is cleft by Luke into two halves : (*a*) The blind man as such, whom he places before the entrance of Jericho ; (*b*) the Pagan element in the blind man, which is placed after leaving Jericho (in Zaccheus)."

† Ver. 2. D. G 7 Mnn. Syr. Hᵖˡᵉʳⁱᵍᵘᵉ, Vg. omit καλούμενος. ℵ. L. Syrᶜᵘʳ. omit ουτος between και and ην. B K. Π. some Mnn. Itᵃˡⁱᵍ. Vg. omit ην. Ver. 4. The MSS. are divided between προδραμων (T. R. and Alex.) and προσδραμων (Byz and 25 Mnn.). ℵ. B. L. add εις το before εμπροσθεν. Instead of δι' εκεινης, which T. R. reads with A. and 2 Mnn. only, all the others, εκεινης. Ver. 5. ℵ. B. L. omit the words ειδεν αυτον και. Ver. 8. G. K. M. Π. several Mnn., κυριον instead of Ιησουν. Ver. 9. ℵ* L. R. omit εστιν after Αβρααμ.

Σταθείς denotes a firm and dignified attitude, such as suits a man whose honor is attacked. "He whom Thou hast thought good to choose as Thy host, is not, as is alleged, a being unworthy of Thy choice." Did Zaccheus pronounce the words of ver. 8 at the time when Jesus had just come under his roof? This is what we should be led to suppose at the first glance by the words: *but he stood;* nevertheless, this movement on the part of Zaccheus would appear a little hasty, and the answer of Jesus: *Salvation is come* (ver. 9), proves that He had already sojourned for a time with His host. Was it, then, at the moment when Jesus was resuming His journey (Schleiermacher, Olshausen)? Vers. 11 and 28 may support this supposition. But the word *to-day* (ver. 9), which recalls the *to-day* of ver. 5, places this dialogue on the very day of His arrival. The most suitable time appears to be that of the evening meal, while Jesus converses peacefully with His host and the numerous guests. Unless the terms of vers. 11 and 28 are immoderately pressed, they are not opposed to this view.

Most modern interpreters take the words of Zaccheus as a vow inspired by his gratitude for the grace which he has just experienced. Ἰδού, *behold*, is taken to indicate a sudden resolution "Take note of this resolution: From this moment I give . . . and I pledge myself to restore . . ." But if the pres. *I give* may certainly apply to a gift which Zaccheus makes at the instant once for all, the pres. *I restore fourfold* seems rather to designate a rule of conduct already admitted and long practised by him. It is unnatural to apply it to a measure which would relate only to some special cases of injustice to be repaired in the future. Ἰδού, *behold*, is in keeping with the unexpected revelation, so far as the public are concerned, in this rule of Zaccheus, till then unknown by all, and which he now reveals, only to show the injustice of those murmurs with which the course of Jesus is met. "Thou hast not brought contempt on Thyself by accepting me as Thy host, publican though I am; and it is no ill-gotten gain with which I entertain Thee." In this sense, the σταθείς δέ, *but he stood*, is fully intelligible. By the half of his goods, Zaccheus, of course, understands the half of his yearly income. In the case of a wrong done to a neighbor, the law exacted, when restitution was voluntary, a fifth over and above the sum taken away (Num. 5 : 6, 7). Zaccheus went vastly further. Perhaps the restitution which he imposed on himself was that forcibly exacted from the detected thief. In a profession like his, it was easy to commit involuntary injustices. Besides, Zaccheus had under his authority many employés for whom he could not answer.

Jesus accepts this apology of Zaccheus, which indeed has its worth in reply to the murmurs of the crowd; and without allowing the least meritorious value to those restitutions and those extraordinary almsgivings, He declares that Zaccheus is the object of divine grace as much as those can be who accuse him. His entrance into his house has brought salvation thither. Notwithstanding the words, "Jesus said unto him . . ." the words following are addressed not to Zaccheus, but to the entire assembly. The πρὸς αὐτόν, *unto him*, therefore signifies: with His eyes turned upon him as the subject of His answer; comp. 7 : 44. Jesus is the living salvation. Received as He was into the house, He brought into it by His very presence this heavenly blessing. Καθότι, *agreeably to the fact that* (for so much as), indicates the reason why Jesus can assert that Zaccheus is saved this day. But is this reason the fact that Zaccheus is a descendant of Abraham according to the flesh, and has preserved this characteristic as much as any other Jew, notwithstanding his Rabbinical

excommunication? No; Jesus could not make the possibility of salvation dependent on the naked characteristic of being a member of the Israelitish nation. This idea would be in contradiction to His whole teaching, and to the very saying which concludes this verse. The term, *son of Abraham*, must therefore be taken in its spiritual sense: "Zaccheus is restored to this character which he had lost by his excommunication. He possesses it in a still higher sense than that in which he had lost it." Ver. 10. *Lost*, so far as a son of Abraham according to the flesh; but *found* (he, the same one, καὶ αὐτός), as a son of Abraham according to the spirit. Thus the maxim of ver 10 readily connects itself with ver. 9.

According to Hilgenfeld (p. 206), this piece is not in the least Pauline; it belongs to the ancient Ebionite source. According to Holtzmann, on the contrary (p. 234), it is entirely Luke's. It may be seen how critics agree with one another on questions of this sort! As concerns ourselves, we have established an Aramaic source. On the other hand, we are at one with Holtzmann in acknowledging the traces of Luke's style (καθότι, ver. 9; ἡλικία, ver. 3; ἐκείνης, ver. 4; διαγογγύζειν, ver. 7). Hence we conclude that Luke himself translated into Greek this account, which is taken from an Aramaic document.

9. *The Parable of the Pounds:* 19 : 11–27.—Ver. 11. *The Introduction.*—We have already observed in the multitudes (14 : 25, 18 : 38, 19 : 1–3), and even in the disciples (18 : 31; comp. with Matt. 20 : 20, *et seq.*), the traces of an excited state. Ver. 11 shows that it went on increasing as they approached Jerusalem. The profound calmness and self-possession of Jesus contrasts with the agitation which is produced around Him. The words ἀκουόντων αὐτῶν, "as they heard these things," and προσθεὶς εἶπε, "He added, and spake," establish a close relation between the parable of the pounds and the preceding conversation. But we need not conclude therefrom that this parable was uttered *as a continuation* of the conversation. It may, indeed, have been so merely in respect of time (ver. 28). The relation indicated by the introduction is purely moral: the so striking contrast between the conduct of Jesus toward Zaccheus, and the generally received ideas, was such that every one felt that a decisive crisis was near. The new was on the eve of appearing; and this imminent revolution naturally presented itself to the imagination of all in the form in which it had always been described to them. The word παραχρῆμα, *immediately*, stands first in the proposition, because it expresses the thought against which the parable following is directed. The verb, ἀναφαίνεσθαι *to appear*, answers well to the great spectacle for which they were looking. That Luke himself deduced this introduction from the contents of the parable, as Weizsäcker supposes, is not impossible. But up to this point we have too often recognized the historical value of those short introductions, not to admit that Luke's source, from which he took the parable, contained some indication of the circumstances which had called it forth.

Vers. 12–14.* *The Probation.*—A man of noble birth goes to ask from the sovereign of the country which he inhabits the government of his province. Before undertaking this journey, which must be a long one—for the sovereign dwells in a distant country—this man, concerned about the future administration of the state after his return, puts to the proof the servants who have till now formed his own household, and whom he proposes afterward to make his officers. For that purpose he confides to each of them a sum of money, to be turned to account in his absence. Hereby he will be able to estimate their fidelity and capability, and to assign them in the new

* Ver. 13 8 Mj; 20 Mnn. Or. read εν ω instead of εως.

state of things a place proportioned to the qualities of which they shall have given proof. Meanwhile the future subjects protest before the sovereign against the elevation of their fellow-citizen. Some features in this picture seem borrowed from the political situation of the Holy Land. Josephus relates that on the death of Herod the Great, Archelaus, his son, whom he had appointed his heir, repaired to Rome to request that Augustus would invest him in his father's dominions, but that the Jews, wearied of this dynasty of adventurers, begged the emperor rather to convert their country into a Roman province. This case might the more readily occur to the mind of Jesus, as at that very Jericho where He was speaking there stood the magnificent palace which this Archelaus had built. The word *εὐγενής, of noble birth*, evidently refers to the superhuman nature of Jesus. Μακράν is an adverb, as at 15 : 13. This far distance is the emblem of the long interval which, in the view of Jesus, was to separate His departure from His return.

The expression, *to receive a kingdom*, includes the installation of Jesus in His heavenly power, as well as the preparation of His Messianic kingdom here below by the sending of the Holy Spirit and His work in the Church. A *mina*, among the Hebrews, was worth about £6 sterling.* It is not, as in Matt. 25 : 14, *all his goods*, which the master distributes ; the sum, too, is much less considerable ; the talents of which Matthew speaks are each worth about £400. The idea is therefore different In Luke, the money intrusted is simply a means of testing. In Matthew, the matter in question is the administration of the owner's fortune. The sums intrusted, being in Luke the same for all the servants, represent not gifts (*χαρίσματα*), which are very various, but the grace of salvation common to all believers (pardon and the Holy Spirit). The position of every believer in the future kingdom depends on the use which he makes of that grace here below. It is surprising to hear Jesus call this salvation an *ἐλάχιστον, a very little* (ver. 17). What an idea of future glory is given to us by this saying ! The Alex. reading, *ἐν ᾧ*, ver. 13, assumes that *ἔρχομαι* has the meaning of *travelling ;* while with *ἕως* it would signify *to arrive*. The first reading implies that the time during which the absence of Jesus lasts is a constant returning, which is perfectly in keeping with the biblical view. "I say unto you, that *from this time* ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the throne . . . *and coming in the clouds of heaven*," Matt. 26 : 64. The ascension is the first step in His return here below. Ver. 14 describes the resistance of the Jews to the Messianic sovereignty of Jesus, and that during all the time which separates His first from His second coming

Vers. 15–19.† *The Faithful Servants.*—From ver. 15 onward Jesus depicts what will happen at the Parousia. Every servant will share in the power of his master, now become king, in a degree proportioned to his activity during the time of his probation (the reign of grace). While the means of action had been the same, the results differ ; the amount of power committed to each will therefore also differ in the same proportion. It is entirely otherwise in Matthew. The sums committed were different ; the results are equal in so far as they are proportioned to the sums received ; there is therefore here equality of faithfulness and equal testimony of satisfaction. Everything in Matthew's representation turns on the personal relation of the servants to their master, whose fortune (ver. 14, *his* goods) they are commissioned

* Keil, "Handb. der Bibl. Archäologie," vol. ii. p. 144.

† Ver. 15. ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn. Or., *δεδωκει* instead of *εδωκεν*. ℵ. B. D. L. Syr^{cur}. Or., *τι διεπραγματευσαι το* instead of *τις τι διεπραγματευσατο*. Ver. 17. B. D. 3 Mnn. Or., *ευγε* instead of *ευ*.

to administer and increase, and who rejoices equally in the active fidelity of all; while in Luke the one point in question is to settle the position of the servants in the economy of glory which is opening, and consequently to determine the proportion of faithfulness displayed during the time of labor and probation which has just closed. The ten, the five cities (vers. 17 and 19), represent moral beings in a lower state of development, but whom the glorified faithful are commissioned to raise to their divine destination.

Vers. 20–27.* Of the other seven servants there is no mention; they fall either into the category of the preceding, or into that of the following. The ground on which the latter explains his inactivity is not a mere pretext. His language is too plain-spoken not to be sincere. He is a believer who has not found the state of grace offered by Jesus so brilliant as he hoped—a legal Christian, who has not tasted grace, and knows nothing of the gospel but its severe morality. It seems to him that the Lord gives very little to exact so much. With such a feeling, the least possible only will be done. God should be satisfied with us if we abstain from doing ill, from squandering our talent. Such would have been the language of a Judas dissatisfied with the poverty of Christ's spiritual kingdom. In Matthew, the unfaithful servant is offended not at the insufficiency of the master's gifts in general, but at the inferiority of those given to himself, in comparison with those of his associates. This is a Judas embittered at the sight of the higher position assigned to Peter or John.

The master's answer (ver. 22) is an *argumentum ad hominem:* The more thou knowest that I am austere, the more shouldest thou have endeavored to satisfy me! The Christian who lacks the sweet experience of grace ought to be the most anxious of laborers. The fear of doing ill is no reason for doing nothing, especially when there are means of action, the use of which covers our entire responsibility. What does Jesus mean by the *banker?* Could it be those Christian associations to which every believer may intrust the resources which he cannot use himself? It seems to us that Jesus by this image would rather represent the divine omnipotence of which we may avail ourselves by prayer, without thereby exposing the cause of Christ to any risk. Of him who has not worked the Lord will ask, Hast thou at least prayed? The dispensation of glory changes in the case of such a servant into an eternity of loss and shame. The holy works which he might have wrought here below, along with the powers by which he might have accomplished them, are committed to the servant who has shown himself the most active. This or that Pagan population, for example, which might have been evangelized by the young Christian who remained on the earth the slave of selfish ease, shall be committed in the future dispensation to the devoted missionary who has used his powers here below in the service of Jesus. At ver. 26, the same form of address as at 12 : 41, 42. The Lord continues as if no observation had been interposed, replying all the while, nevertheless, to the objection which has been started. There is a law, in virtue of which every grace actively appropriated increases our receptivity for higher graces, while all grace rejected diminishes our aptitude for receiving new graces. From this law of moral life it follows,

* Ver. 20. ℵ^{c}. B. D. L. R. 2 Mnn., *ο ετερος* instead of *ετερος*. Ver 22. 9 Mjj. omit *δε* after *λεγει*. Ver. 23 All the Mjj. except K. omit *την* before *τραπεζαν*. Ver. 26. ℵ. B. L. 7 Mnn. omit *γαρ* after *λεγω*. ℵ. B. L. 7 Mnn. omit *απ' αυτου* after *αρθησεται*.. Ver. 27. The MSS. are divided between *εκεινους* (T. R., Byz.) and *τουτους* (Alex.) ℵ. B. F. L. R. some Mnn. Syr. add *αυτους* after *κατασφαξατε*.

that gradually all graces must be concentrated in faithful workers, and be withdrawn from negligent servants. Chap. 8 : 18, Jesus said, *That which he seemeth to have;* here he says, *That he hath.* The two expressions are true. We have a grace which is bestowed on us ; but if we do not assimilate it actively, we do not really possess it ; we imagine we have it.

Ver. 27 (comp. ver. 14) represents the Messiah's reckoning with the Jewish people, as vers. 15-26 represent His reckoning with the Church. Πλήν, *only:* "After judging the servants, there remains only one thing." This punishment of the Jews includes, along with the destruction of Jerusalem, the state of rejection in which they are plunged till the Lord's return.

The ruling idea of this parable in Luke is therefore that of a time of probation between the departure and the return of the Lord, necessary to prepare the sentence which shall fix the position of every one in the state of things following the Parousia. Hence follows the impossibility of that immediate appearing of the kingdom of God which filled the minds of the crowd now accompanying Jesus to Jerusalem. Luke's parable thus forms, as Holtzmann acknowledges, a complete whole ; and whatever the same learned critic may say, it must be confessed that the introduction, ver. 11, indicates its true bearing—a fact confirming the idea that this introduction belonged to Luke's sources, and proceeded from accurate tradition.

The relation between this parable and that of the talents in Matthew is difficult to determine. Strauss has alleged that Luke's was a combination of that of the husbandmen (Luke 20) and that of the talents (Matt. 25). But the internal harmony of Luke's description, which Holtzmann acknowledges, does not admit of this supposition. Meyer regards it as a rehandling of the parable of the talents in Matthew. The action is undoubtedly similar, but, as we have seen, the thought is radically different. The aim of Matthew's parable seems to be to encourage those who have received less, by promising them the same approbation from the Master if they are equally faithful, and by putting them on their guard against the temptation of making their inferiority a motive to spiritual indifference, and a pretext for idleness. We have seen that the idea of the parable in Luke is quite different. It must therefore be admitted that there were two parables uttered, but that their images were borrowed from very similar fields of life. The analogy between the two descriptions may perhaps have caused the importation of some details from the one into the other (*e.g.*, the dialogue between the master and the unfaithful servant).

Here we have reached the end of that journey, the account of which begins 9 : 51. Jesus first traversed the countries lying south from the old scene of His activity, then the border regions of Samaria and Galilee, finally Perea : He has thus come to the gates of Jerusalem. From the moral point of view, His work also has reached a new stage. On the one hand, the enthusiasm of the people is at its height, and all believing Galilee, the nucleus of His future Church in Israel, accompanies Him to form His retinue when He shall make His kingly entry into His capital ; on the other, He has completely broken with the pharisaic party, and His separation from the nation as such, swayed by the pharisaic spirit, is consummated. He must die ; for to let Him live would, on the part of the Sanhedrim, be to abdicate.

We have not followed step by step Keim's criticism on this last part of the journey. It is the masterpiece of arbitrariness. Whatever does not square with the proportions of Jesus as settled beforehand by the learned critic, is eliminated for one reason or another. Those reasons are found without difficulty when sought. After John, Luke is the most abused. For Matthew's two blind men he substitutes one,

because he thinks right to reproduce the other in the form of the person of Zaccheus. Timeus (*the impure*) becomes Zaccheus (*the pure*), the impure pure! Mark replaces the second by Timeus, the father (also blind) of Bartimeus! Keim here reaches the height of Volkmar. The blindness is overcome by the power of enthusiasm which was reigning at the moment, and which, by exalting the force of the vital nervous fluid, reopens the closed eyes temporarily or lastingly! Luke invents, in the despised person of Zaccheus, a counterpart to proud Jerusalem, which *knows not the day of her visitation* (19 : 42). It is true that this last expression of Jesus, as well as His tears over Jerusalem, with which it is connected, is invented, as much as the history of Zaccheus. The two counterparts are imaginary!

FIFTH PART.

SOJOURN AT JERUSALEM.

CHAP. 19 : 28–21 : 38.

THIS part includes three principal events : I. The entry of Jesus into Jerusalem (19 : 28–44). II. The exercise of His Messianic sovereignty in the temple (19 : 45–21 : 4). III. The prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Jewish people (21 : 5–38). The relation between these three events is easily understood. The first is the final appeal of Jesus to His people ; with the second there is connected the decisive rejection of Israel ; the third is, as it were, the pronouncing of the sentence which falls on this refusal.

FIRST CYCLE.—CHAP. 19 : 28–44.

The Entry of Jesus into Jerusalem.

This narrative embraces : 1*st* The preparations for the entry (vers. 28–36) ; 2*d*. The joy of the disciples and of the multitude on coming in sight of Jerusalem (vers. 38–40) ; 3*d*. The tears of Jesus at the same instant (vers. 41–44).

1*st*. Vers. 28–36.* *The Preparations for the Entry.*—The connection indicated by the words, *while thus speaking, He went*, is rather moral than of time : " while speaking thus [of the unbelief of Israel], He nevertheless continued His journey (imperf. ἐπορεύετο) to Jerusalem." Ἔμπροσθεν signifies not *in advance* (εἰς τὸ πρόσθεν), but *before* [His disciples], at their head. Comp. Mark 10 . 32 : " They were in the way going up to Jerusalem ; and Jesus went before them, and they were amazed, and as they followed they were afraid."

According to John, while the great body of the caravan pursued its way to Jerusalem, Jesus stopped at Bethany, where a feast was prepared for Him, and where He passed one or even two nights ; and it was after this stay that He solemnly entered the capital, where the rumor of His approach had already spread. These circumstances fully explain the scene of Palm Day, which in the synoptical account comes

* Ver. 29. Marcion omitted all the piece, vers. 29–46. ℵ. B. L. some Mnn. omit αυτου after μαθητων. Ver. 30. ℵ. B. D. L. 3 Mnn. Or., λεγων instead of ειπων. B. D. L. add και before λυσαντες. Ver. 31. 6 Mjj. 3 Mnn. It$^{\text{aliq.}}$ Or. omit αυτω after ερειτε.

upon us somewhat abruptly. Bleek finds a certain obscurity in Luke's expression : "When He came nigh to Bethphage and Bethany," for it is not known how those two localities are related. In Mark (11 : 1) the same difficulty (Matt 21 : 1 does not speak of Bethany). Add to this that the O. T nowhere speaks of a village called Bethphage, and that tradition, which indicates the site of Bethany so certainly, says absolutely nothing about that of this hamlet. The Talmud alone mentions Bethphage, and in such a way as to show that this locality was very near Jerusalem, and was even joined to the city. Bethphage is without the walls, it is said ; and the bread which is prepared in it is sacred, like that which is made in the city (Bab. Pesachim, 63. 2 ; Menachoth, 7. 6, etc.) Lightfoot, Rénan, Caspari * have concluded from these passages that Bethphage was not a hamlet, but a district, the precinct of the city extending eastward as far as the Mount of Olives, and even to Bethany. According to the Rabbins, Jerusalem was to the people what the camp had formerly been to Israel in the wilderness. And as at the great feasts the city could not contain all the pilgrims who came from a distance, and who should strictly have found an abode *in the camp* (the city), and there celebrated the feast, there was added, they say, to Jerusalem, to make it sufficient, all this district situated on the side of the Mount of Olives, and which bore the name of *Bethphage* (*place of figs*). Bethany was the beginning of this district where the pilgrims encamped in a mass ; and perhaps its name came from *Beth-Chani, place of booths* (the merchants' tents set up in the sight of this multitude) (Caspari, p. 163). Nothing could in this case be more exact than the mode of expression used by Luke and Mark : *when he came to Bethphage* (the sacred district) *and to Bethany* (the hamlet where this district began). Ἐλαιῶν might be taken as the gen. plural of ἐλαία, *olive trees* (ἐλαιῶν). But in Josephus this word is the name of the mountain itself (ἐλαιών, *olive wood*) ; comp. also Acts 1 : 12. This is the most probable sense in our passage. At ver. 37 and 22 : 39, where Luke uses this word in the first sense, he indicates it by the art. τῶν.

The sending of the two disciples proves the deliberate intention of Jesus to give a certain solemnity to this scene. Till then He had withdrawn from popular expressions of homage ; but once at least He wished to show Himself as King Messiah to His people (ver. 40). It was a last call addressed by Him to the population of Jerusalem (ver. 42). This course, besides, could no longer compromise His work. He knew that in any case death awaited Him in the capital. John (12 . 14) says simply, Jesus found the young ass, without indicating in what way. But the words which follow, "The disciples remembered that they had done these things unto Him," ver 16, allude to a doing on the part of the disciples which John himself has not mentioned. His account, therefore, far from contradicting that of the Syn., assumes it as true. The remark, *whereon yet never man sat* (ver 30), is in keeping with the kingly and Messianic use which is about to be made of the animal. Comp Deut 21 3. Matthew not only mentions the colt, but also the ass. Accompanied by its mother, the animal, though not broken in, would go the more quietly. What are we to think of the critics (Strauss, Volkmar) who allege that, according to Matthew's text, Jesus mounted the two animals at once! The ease with which Jesus obtains the use of this beast, which does not belong to Him, is another trait of the royal greatness which He thinks good to display on this occasion. Οὕτως, ver. 31 (Mark and Matthew, εὐθέως), "Thus ; and that will suffice." Luke and Mark do not cite the

* "Chronol. geograph. Einleitung in das Leben Jesu" 1869, pp 161 and 162.

prophecy of Zechariah. It was not necessary that every one should understand the symbolical meaning of this scene, and contrast the peaceful beast with the warlike steeds of earthly conquerors. A new proof of the supernatural knowledge of Jesus, which must not be confounded with omniscience ; comp. 22 : 10, 31–34 ; John 1 : 49, 4 : 17, etc. According to Mark, who loves to describe details, the colt was tied to a door *at a crossway* (ἄμφοδος). It was no doubt the place where the little path leading to the house of the owners of the ass went off from the highway ; or might it be the crossing of two roads, that which Jesus followed (going from east to west), and that which to the present day passes along the crest of the mountain (from north to south)? The term κύριος, *Lord* (ver. 34), shows the feeling of sovereignty with which Jesus acted. It is probable that He knew the owners. In substituting their garments for the cover which it would have been so easy to procure, the disciples wished to pay homage to Jesus—a fact brought out by the pron. ἑαυτῶν (ver. 35). Comp. 2 Kings 9 : 13.

2*d.* Vers. 37–40.* *The Entry.*—From the moment that Jesus seats Himself on the colt, He becomes the visible centre of the assemblage, and the scene takes a character more and more extraordinary. It is as if a breathing from above had all at once taken possession of this multitude. The sight of the city and temple which opens up at the moment contributes to this burst of joy and hope (ver. 37). The object of ἐγγίζοντος, *coming nigh*, is not πρὸς τῇ καταβάσει (πρὸς τὴν would be necessary) ; it is rather Jerusalem, the true goal of the journey. Πρὸς τῇ is a qualification of ἤρξαντο : "at the descent, they began." From this elevated point, 300 feet above the terrace of the temple, which is itself raised about 140 feet above the level of the valley of the Cedron, an extensive view was had of the city and the whole plain which it commands, especially of the temple, which rose opposite, immediately above the valley. All those hearts recall at this moment the miracles which have distinguished the career of this extraordinary man ; they are aware that at the point to which things have come His entry into Jerusalem cannot fail to issue in a decisive revolution, although they form an utterly false idea of that catastrophe.

John informs us that among all those miracles there was one especially which excited the enthusiasm of the crowd ; that was the resurrection of Lazarus. Already on the previous evening very many pilgrims had come from Jerusalem to Bethany to see not only Jesus, but also Lazarus, who had been raised from the dead. This day the procession meets at every step with new troops arriving from the city ; and these successive meetings call forth ever and again new bursts of joy. The acclamation, ver. 38, is taken in part from Ps. 118 : 25. This hymn belonged to the great Hallel, which was chanted at the end of the Paschal Supper as well as at the feast of Tabernacles. The people were accustomed to apply the expression, *He who cometh in the name of the Lord* (in the Psalm, every faithful one who came to the feast), to the Messiah. Probably the word βασιλεύς, *king*, is authentic in Luke ; and its omission in some MSS. arises from the texts of the LXX. and of Matthew. The expression, *in the name of*, is dependent not on *blessed be*, but on *He who cometh* : "the King who comes on the part of God as His representative." The *peace in heaven* is that of the reconciliation

* Ver. 37. The MSS. are divided between ηρξαντο and ηρξατο. B. D., παντων instead of πασων. Ver. 38. Instead of ο ερχομενος βασιλευς, which T. R. reads, ℵ* Π ο βασιλευς, D. Λ. some Mun. It$^{aliq.}$ ο ερχομενος. Ver. 40. ℵ. B. L. omit αυτοις. ℵ. B L., κραξουσιν instead of κεκραξονται.

which the Messiah comes to effect between God and the earth. Luke omits the word *Hosanna*, which his readers of Gentile origin would not have understood.

The fact related vers. 39 and 40 belongs to Luke alone. Pharisees had mingled with the groups, to spy out what was passing. Aware that their authority is slipping from them (John 12 : 19), they had recourse to Jesus Himself, begging Him to keep order in His crowd of followers. They are disgusted at seeing that, not content with setting Himself up as a prophet, He dares publicly to accept Messianic homage. The saying, *Rebuke thy disciples*, was doubtless accompanied with an irritated and anxious look toward the citadel of Antonia, the residence of the Roman garrison. This look seemed to say : " Seest thou not . . . ? Are not the Romans there ? Wilt thou destroy us ? ' The answer of Jesus has a terrible majesty : " If I should silence all those mouths, you would hear the same acclamations proceeding from the ground ! So impossible is it that an appearance like this should not be, once at least, saluted on the earth as it deserves to be !" The terms used appear to have been proverbial (Hab. 2 : 11). Some have referred the term, *the stones*, to the walls of the temple, and of the houses of Jerusalem, which, as they fell in ruins forty years after, rendered homage to the kingly glory of Jesus ; but this meaning is far-fetched. The form of the Paulo-post future (*κεκράξονται*) is frequently used by the LXX., but, as here, without having the special signification which is attached to it in classical Greek. The grammatical reduplication simply expresses the repetition of the cry of those inanimate objects · " It will be impossible to reduce those stones to silence, if once they shall begin to cry." The simple future in the Alex. is a correction.

3*d*. Vers. 41–44.* *The Lamentations of Jesus.*—Jesus has reached the edge of the plateau (*ὡς ἤγγισεν*) ; the holy city lies before His view (*ἰδὼν τὴν πόλιν*). What a day would it be for it, if the bandage fell from its eyes . But what has just passed between Him and the Pharisees present has awakened in His heart the conviction of the insurmountable resistance which He is about to meet. Then Jesus, seized, and, as it were, wrung by the contrast between what is and what might be, breaks out into sobs. Ἔκλαυσεν, not ἐδάκρυσεν ; we have to do with lamentations, with sobbings, not with tears. The words *even thou* mark a contrast between the population of Jerusalem and that multitude of believers from Galilee and abroad which formed His retinue. Would the inhabitants of Jerusalem but associate themselves with this Messianic festival, their capital would be saved ! From that very day would date the glory of Jerusalem, as well as that of its King. The two words *καίγε* and *σοῦ*, omitted by the Alex., have great importance. " Καίγε, at least in this day, thy last day." This one day which remains to it would suffice to secure its pardon for all the unbelief of the city, and even for all the blood of the prophets formerly shed within its walls ! Does not this word *at least* suppose previous residences of Jesus at Jerusalem ? Σοῦ, added to *ἡμέρα* (*thy* day), alludes to the days, now past, of Capernaum, Bethsaïda, and Chorazin. Jesus does not knock indefinitely at the door of a heart or of a people. In the words, *the things which belong to thy peace*, Jesus thinks at once of the individual salvation of the inhabitants and of the preservation of the entire city. By submitting to the sovereignty of Jesus, Israel would have been preserved from the

* Ver. 41. The MSS. are divided between *επ' αυτη* (T. R., Byz.) and *επ' αυτην* (Alex.). Ver. 42. ℵ. B. L. Or., *ει εγνως εν τη ημερα ταυτη και συ* instead of *ει εγνως και συ καιγε εν τη ημερα σου ταυτη.* ℵ. B. L. omit *σου* after *ειρηνην*. Ver. 43. ℵ. C. L., *παρεμβαλουσιν* instead of *περιβαλουσιν*. Ver. 44. The MSS. are divided between *επι λιθω* (T. R.) and *επι λιθον.*

spirit of carnal exaltation which led to its ruin. The apodosis of, *Oh if . . .* is understood, as at 13 : 9. By the *νῦν δέ, but now*, Jesus reverts from this ideal salvation which He has been contemplating to the sad reality. We must beware of taking, with some commentators, as the subject of *ἐκρύβη, are hid*, the whole of the following clause : "it is concealed from thine eyes that . . ." The sentence thus read would drag intolerably.

Instead of the days of deliverance and glory, the image of which has just passed before His mind, Jesus sees others approaching, which fill His soul with sadness (vers. 43 and 44). Modern criticism agrees in asserting that this description of the destruction of Jerusalem in Luke includes particulars so precise, that it could only have been given *ab eventu*. It therefore concludes confidently from this passage that our Gospel was composed after this catastrophe. But in this case we must refuse to allow Jesus any supernatural knowledge, and relegate to the domain of myth or imposture all the facts of evangelical history in which it is implied, *e.g.*, the announcement of Peter's denial, so well attested by the four Gospels. Besides, if it cannot be denied that the destruction of Jerusalem was foreseen and announced by Jesus, as is implied in His foreseeing the siege, is it not evident that all the particulars of the following description must have presented themselves spontaneously to His mind? We know well how Jesus loves to individualize His idea by giving the most concrete details of its realization. Comp. chap. 17. *Χάραξ*, a palisade of stakes filled in with branches and earth, and generally strengthened by a ditch, behind which the besiegers sheltered themselves. Such a rampart was really constructed by Titus. The Jews burned it in a sally ; it was replaced by a wall. In the LXX. *ἐδαφίζειν* signifies, *to dash on the ground*. But in good Greek it signifies, *to bring down to the level of the ground*. The last sense suits better here, for it applies both to the houses levelled with the ground and to the slaughtered inhabitants. Jesus, like the Zechariah of the O. T. (Zech. 11) and the Zacharias of the New (Luke 1 : 68), represents His coming as the last visit of God to His people. The word *καιρός, the favorable time*, shows that this visit of God is this day reaching its close.

This account is one of the gems of our Gospel. After those arresting details, Luke does not even mention the entry into the city. The whole interest for him lies in the events which precede. Mark (11 : 11) and Matthew (21 : 10) proceed otherwise. The latter sets himself to paint the emotion with which the whole city was seized. Mark (11 : 11) describes in a remarkable way the impressions of Jesus on the evening of the day. Accounts so different cannot be derived from the same written source.

SECOND CYCLE.—CHAP. 19 : 45–21 : 4.

The Reign of Jesus in the Temple.

From this moment Jesus establishes Himself as a sovereign in His Father's house. He there discharges the functions not only of a prophet, but of a legislator and judge ; for some days the theocratic authorities seem to abdicate their powers into His hands. These are the days of the Messiah's sovereignty in His temple (Mal. 3 : 1, 2).

This section contains the following facts : Jesus driving out the sellers (19 : 45–48) ; His answer to an official question of the Sanhedrim regarding His competence (20 : 1–8) ; His announcing their deprivation of authority (20 : 9–19) ; His

escape from the snares laid for Him by the Pharisees and Sadducees (20 : 20–26 and 27–40) ; His putting to them a question respecting the person of the Messiah (20 : 41–44) ; His guarding the people against those seducers (20 : 45–47) ; His setting up, in opposition to their false system of moral appreciation, the true standard of divine judgment (21 : 1–4).

1. *Expulsion of the Sellers :* 19 : 45–48. Vers. 45–48.* Without Mark's narrative we should think that the expulsion of the sellers took place on the day of the entry into Jerusalem. But from that evangelist, whose account is here peculiarly exact, we learn that the entry did not take place till toward the close of the day, and that on that evening the Lord did nothing but give Himself up to the contemplation of the temple. It was on the morrow, when He returned from Bethany, that He purified this place from the profanations which were publicly committed in it. If Matthew and Luke had had before them the account of the original Mark, how and why would they have altered it thus? Holtzmann supposes that Matthew intended by this transposition to connect the *Hosanna* of the children (related immediately afterward) with the *Hosanna* of the multitude. The futility of this reason is obvious. And why and how should Luke, who does not relate the *Hosanna* of the children, introduce the same change into the common document, and that without having known Matthew's narrative ! The entry of Jesus into Jerusalem took place either on Sunday (" Comment. sur l'évang. de Jean," t. ii. pp. 371–373) or on the Monday ; it would therefore be Monday or Tuesday morning when He drove out the sellers. Stalls (חניות) had been set up in the court of the Gentiles. There were sold the animals required as sacrifices ; there pilgrims, who came from all countries of the world, found the coins of the country which they needed. There is nothing to prove that this exchange had to do with the didrachma which was paid for the temple.† The words *καὶ ἀγοράζοντας, and them that bought,* are perhaps borrowed from the other two Syn. But they may also have been omitted, in consequence of confounding the two endings *ντας*. The saying of Jesus is taken from Isa. 56 : 7 and Jer. 7 : 11. Luke does not, like Mark, quote the first passage to the end : " My house shall be called a house of prayer *πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι, for all peoples.*" Those last words, however, agreed perfectly with the spirit of his Gospel. He has not therefore borrowed this quotation from Mark. The appropriateness of this quotation from Isaiah is the more striking, because it was in the court of the Gentiles that those profanations were passing. Israel was depriving the Gentiles of the place which Jehovah had positively reserved for them in His house (1 Kings 8 : 41–43). By the designation, *a den of thieves,* Jesus alludes to the deceptions which were connected with those different bargainings, and especially with the business of the exchangers. If Israel in a spirit of holiness had joined with Jesus in this procedure, the act would have ceased to have a simply typical value ; it would have become the real inauguration of the Messianic kingdom.

Vers. 47 and 48 are of the nature of a summary ; the *καθ' ἡμέραν, daily,* and the imperfects, *they sought,* etc., prove that Luke does not affect to give a complete account of these last days. The words, *the chief of the people,* are added as an appendix to the subject of the verb *sought.* They probably denote the chiefs of the syna-

* Ver. 45. ℵ. B. C. L. 13 Mnn. Or. omit *εν αυτω* after *πωλουντας*. ℵ. B. L. 2 Mnn. Or. omit *και αγοραζοντας*. Ver. 46. ℵ. omits *εστι*. B. L. R. 9 Mnn. Or. add *και εσται* before *ο οικος*, and reject *εστιν*.

† As we had supposed in our " Comment. sur l'évang. de Jean," t. i. p. 376.

gogue representing the people, who, with the priests and scribes, formed the Sanhedrim. This singular construction arises from the fact that the real instigators of hostilities against Jesus were the priests and scribes ; the chief of the people only yielded to this pressure. This idea forms the transition from ver. 47 to ver. 48. The people formed the support of Jesus against the theocratic authorities. Certainly, if He had thought of establishing an earthly kingdom, now would have been the time. The passage Mark 11 : 18 is the parallel of those two verses. But neither of the two accounts can proceed from the other.

Should this event be regarded as identical with the similar one which John places at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, 2 : 13, *et seq.* ? This seems to have been the generally received opinion in Origen's time (in Joh. T. x. 15). As the Syn. relate none but this last residence at Jerusalem, it would be very natural for them to introduce here different events which properly belonged to previous residences. See, nevertheless, in our "Comment. sur l'evang. de Jean," t. i. p. 391, the reasons which make it probable that the two events are different. Here we shall add two remarks : 1. Mark's narrative must rest on the detailed account of an eye-witness. Comp. those minute particulars : "And Jesus entered into Jerusalem, and into the temple ; *and when He had looked round about upon all things, and now the eventide was come*, He went out unto Bethany with the Twelve" (11 : 11) ; "And would not suffer that any man should carry any vessel through the temple" (ver. 16). These are such details as are not invented ; it was not tradition that had preserved them (see Luke and Matthew). They proceed, therefore, from an eye-witness. How in this case can we question Mark's narrative, and consequently that of the three Syn. ? 2. If Jesus was returning for the first time after the lapse of two years (John 2) to the feast of Passover, which more than any other gave occasion to those scandals (Bleek on Matt. 21 : 12), He could not but be roused anew against the abuses which He had checked the first time, more especially in the Messianic attitude which He had taken up. Here, then, again John supplies what the others have omitted, and omits what they have sufficiently narrated.

2. *The Question of the Sanhedrim :* 20 : 1-8.—Vers. 1-8.* This account is separated from the preceding, in Mark and Matthew, by the brief mention of two events : in Mark 11 : 16, the prohibition of Jesus to carry vessels across the temple—the court was probably used as a thoroughfare (Bleek) ; in Matt. 21 : 14, *et seq.*, the cures wrought in the temple, and the hosannas of the children. The authority which Jesus thus assumed in this sacred place was well suited to occasion the step taken by the Sanhedrim. If we follow Mark, it must have taken place on the day after the purification of the temple and the cursing of the barren fig-tree, and consequently on the Tuesday or Wednesday morning. Luke omits those events, which were unknown to him, as well as the cursing of the barren fig-tree, which related specially to Israel.

Since the evening before, the members of the Sanhedrim had been in consultation (ζητειν of 19: 47) ; and their *seeking* had not been in vain. They had succeeded in inventing a series of questions fitted to entangle Jesus, or in the end to extract from Him an answer which would compromise Him either with the people or with the Jewish or Gentile authorities. The question of ver. 2 is the first result of those con-

* Ver. 1. ℵ. B. D. L. Q. several Mnn. Syr. It. Vg. omit εκεινων after ημερων. The mss. are divided between αρχιερεις (T. R., Alex.) and ιερεις (Byz.). Ver. 2. ℵ* C. omit ειπε ημιν. ℵ[a] B. L. R. 2 Mnn. read ειπον instead of ειπε. Ver. 3. ℵ. B. L. R. 7 Mnn. omit ενα before λογον. Ver. 4. ℵ. D. L. R. add το before Ιωαννου. Ver. 5. ℵ. C. D. Syr[cur.] Ipplerique, Vg., συνελογιζοντο instead of συνελογισαντο. 13 Mjj. several Mnn. It[aliq.] omit ουν after διατι. Ver. 6. ℵ. B. D. L some Mnn., ο λαος απας instead of πας ο λαος.

elaves. Ver. 1 enumerates the three classes of members composing the Sanhedrim ; it was therefore a formal deputation, comp. John 1 : 19, *et seq.* The *elders* are mentioned here also (comp. 19 : 47) as secondary personages, beside the high priests and scribes. The first part of the question relates to the *nature* of Jesus' commission : is it divine or human ? The second, to the *intermediate agent* through whom He has received it. The Sanhedrim made sure that Jesus would claim a divine commission, and hoped to take advantage of this declaration to bring Jesus to its bar, and to sit in judgment on the question. On the one hand, Jesus avoids this snare ; on the other, He avoids declining the universally recognized competency of the Sanhedrim. He replies in such a way as to force His adversaries themselves to declare their incompetence. The question which He lays before them is not a skilful manœuvre ; it is dictated by the very nature of the situation. Was it not through the instrumentality of John the Baptist that Jesus had been divinely accredited to the people ? The acknowledgment, therefore, of Jesus' authority really depended on the acknowledgment of John's. The second alternative, *of men*, includes the two possible cases, of himself, or of some other human authority. The embarrassment of His adversaries is expressed by the three Syn. in ways so different that it is impossible to derive the three forms from one and the same written source. This question has sufficed to disconcert them. They, the wise, the skilled, who affect to judge of everything in the theocracy—they shamefully decline a judgment in face of an event of such capital importance as was the appearing of John ! There is a blending of indignation and contempt in the *neither do I* of Jesus (ver. 8). But that answer which He refuses them, they who have refused Him theirs, He goes on to give immediately after in the following parable. Only it is *to the whole people* that He will address it (πρὸς τὸν λαόν, ver. 9), as a solemn protestation against the hypocritical conduct of their chiefs.

Why did Luke omit the cursing of the barren fig-tree ? He was well aware, answers Volkmar, that it was simply an *idea* represented by Mark in the form of a *fact ;* and he restored to it it true character by presenting it, 13 : 6–9, in the form of a parable. So the description of God's *patience* toward Israel, the barren fig-tree (13 : 6–9), is one and the same lesson with the *cursing* of that same fig-tree ! Why does Matthew make the cursing of the fig-tree and the conversation of Jesus with His disciples on that occasion fall at the same period and on the same day—two facts which are separated in Mark by a whole day ? Holtzmann answers : On reading (Mark 11 : 12) the first half of this account, Matthew determined to leave it out. But on coming to the second half (Mark 5 : 20), he took the resolution to insert it ; only he combined them in one. So, when the evangelist was composing his narrative, he read for the first time the document containing the history which he was relating ! In view of such admirable discoveries, is there not reason to say : *Risum teneatis ?*

3. *The Parable of the Husbandmen :* 20 : 9–19.—This parable, in Matthew, is preceded by that of the two sons. If, as the terms of the latter suppose, it applies to the conduct of the chiefs toward John the Baptist, it is admirably placed before that of the husbandmen, which depicts the conduct of those same chiefs toward Jesus.

Vers. 9–12.* We have just attested the accuracy of the introduction, and especially that of the words *to the people*, ver. 9. Holtzmann judges otherwise : " A par-

* Ver. 9. Marcion omitted vers. 9–18. 19 Mjj. the most of the Mnn. It^{plerique}, Vg. omit τις after ανθρωπος, which T. R. reads, with A. some Mnn Syr. Ver. 10. ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ omit εν before καιρω. The mss. are divided between δωσιν (T. R., Byz.) and δωσουσιν (Alex.). Ver. 12. A. K. II. some Mnn. It^{plerique}, Vg., κακεινον instead of και τουτον.

able *inappropriately addressed to the people* in Luke," says he. Is it possible to pronounce a falser judgment? The vine denotes the theocratic people, and the husbandmen the authorities who govern them. Luke speaks neither of the *tower* meant to receive the workmen's tools and to guard the domain, which perhaps represents the kingly office; nor of the *wine-press*, the means of turning the domain to account, which is perhaps the image of the priesthood (comp. Matthew and Mark). The absence of the proprietor corresponds to that whole period of the O. T. which followed the great manifestations by which God founded the theocracy—the going out of Egypt, the giving of the law, and the settlement of Israel in Canaan. From that moment Israel should have offered to its God *the fruits* of a gratitude and fidelity proportioned to the favor which it had received from Him. The three servants successively sent represent the successive groups of prophets, those divine messengers whose struggles and sufferings are described (Heb. 11) in such lively colors. There is a climax in the conduct of the husbandmen: ver. 10, the envoy is beaten; ver. 11, beaten and shamefully abused; ver. 12, wounded to death and cast out of the vineyard. In this last touch, Jesus alludes to the fate of Zacharias (11 : 51), and probably also to that of John the Baptist. In Mark the climax is nearly the same: ἐδειραν (*to beat*), ἐκεφαλαίωσαν (here, *to wound in the head*), ἀπέκτειναν (*to kill*). Mark speaks also of other messengers who underwent the same treatment; it is perhaps this last description which should be applied to John the Baptist. Matthew speaks only of two sendings, but each embracing several individuals. Should we understand the two principal groups of prophets: Isaiah, with his surrounding of minor prophets, and Jeremiah with his? The Hebraistic expression προσέθετο πέμψαι (vers. 11 and 12) shows that Luke is working on an Aramaic document. No similar expression occurs in Matthew and Mark.

Vers. 13–16.* The master of the vineyard rouses himself in view of this obstinate and insolent rejection: *What shall I do?* And this deliberation leads him to a final measure: *I will send my beloved son.* This saying, put at that time by Jesus in the mouth of God, has a peculiar solemnity. There is His answer to the question: *By what authority doest thou these things?* Here, as everywhere, the meaning of the title son transcends absolutely the notion of Messiah, or theocratic king, or any *office* whatever. The title expresses above all the notion of a personal relation to God as Father. The theocratic office flows from this relation. By this name, Jesus establishes between the servants and Himself an immeasurable distance. This was implied already by the question, *What shall I do . . .?* which suggests the divine dialogue, Gen. 1 : 26, whereby the creation of inferior beings is separated from that of man. Ἴσως, properly, *in a way agreeable to expectation;* and hence, *undoubtedly* (E. V. improperly, *it may be*). But does not God know beforehand the result of this last experiment? True; but this failure will not at all overturn His plan. Not only will the mission of this last messenger be successful with *some*, but the resistance of the people as a whole, by bringing on their destruction, will open up the world to the free preaching of salvation by those few. The ignorance of the future which is ascribed to the master of the vineyard belongs to the figure. The idea represented by this detail is simply the reality of human liberty.

* Ver. 13. ℵ. B. C. D. L. Q. some Mnn. Syr^{cur}. It^{plerique}, omit ἰδοντες before εντραπησονται. Ver. 14. A. K. Π. 4 Mnn. It^{plerique}, διελογισαντο instead of διελογιζοντο. ℵ. B. D. L. R. some Mnn., προς αλληλους instead of προς εαυτους. 6 Mjj. 12 Mnn. It^{plerique}, omit δευτε before αποκτεινωμεν.

The deliberation of the husbandmen (ver. 14) is an allusion to that of the chiefs, ver. 5 (*διελογίζοντο* or—*σαντο* ; comp. with *συνελογίσαντο*). Jesus unveils before all the people the plots of their chiefs, and the real cause of the hatred with which they follow Him. These men have made the theocracy their property (John 11 : 48 : *our place our nation*) ; and this power, which till now they have turned to their advantage, they cannot bring themselves to give up into the hands of the Son, who comes to claim it in His Father's name. At ver. 15 Jesus describes with the most striking calmness the crime which they are preparing to commit on His person, and from which He makes not the slightest effort to escape. Is the act of *casting out of the vineyard*, which precedes the murder, intended to represent the excommunication already pronounced on Jesus and His adherents (John 9 : 22)? In Mark the murder precedes ; then the dead body is thrown out. The punishment announced in ver. 16 might, according to Luke and Mark, apply only to the theocratic authorities, and not to the entire people. The *ἄλλοι*, the *other* husbandmen, would in this case designate the apostles and their successors. But the sense appears to be different according to Matthew. Here the word *to others* is thus explained, 21 : 43 : "The kingdom of God shall be given to a *nation* (*ἔθνει*) bringing forth the fruits thereof." According to this, the point in question is not the substitution of the *chiefs* of the N. T. for those of the Old, but that of Gentile *peoples* for the chosen people. What would our critics say if the parts were exchanged, if Luke had expressed himself here as Matthew does, and Matthew as Luke? Matthew puts the answer of ver. 16 in the mouth of the adversaries of Jesus, which on their part could only mean, "He shall destroy them, that is evident ; but what have we to do with that? Thy history is but an empty tale." Yet as it is said in ver. 19 that it was not till later that His adversaries understood the bearing of the parable, the narrative of Luke and Mark is more natural. The connection between *ἀκούσαντες* and *εἶπον* is this : "they had no sooner heard than, deprecating the *omen*, they said . . ."

Vers. 17–19.* Ἐμβλέψας, *having beheld them*, indicates the serious, even menacing expression which He then assumed. The *δέ* is adversative : "Such a thing, you say will never happen ; but what meaning, then, do you give to this saying . . .?" Whether in the context of Ps. 118 the *stone rejected* be the Jewish people as a whole, in comparison with the great world-powers, or (according to Bleek and others) the believing part of the people rejected by the unbelieving majority in both cases, the image of the stone despised by the builders applies indirectly to the Messiah, in whom alone Israel's mission to the world, and that of the believing part of the people to the whole, was realized. It is ever, at all stages of their history, the same law whose application is repeated. The acc. *λίθον* is a case of attraction arising from the relative pron. which follows. This form is textually taken from the LXX. (Ps. 118 : 22). The corner-stone is that which forms the junction between the two most conspicuous walls, that which is laid with peculiar solemnity. A truth so stern as the sentence of ver. 18 required to be wrapped up in a biblical quotation. The words of Jesus recall Isa. 8 : 14, 15, and Dan. 2 : 44. In Isaiah, the Messiah is represented as a consecrated stone, against which many of the children of Israel shall be broken. Simeon (2 : 34) makes reference to this saying. The subject in question is the Messiah in His humiliation. A man's dashing himself against this stone laid on the earth means rejecting Him during the time of His humiliation. In the second part of the verse, where this

* Ver. 19. C. D. 15 Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique}, Vg., *εζητουν* instead of *εζητησαν*.

stone is represented as falling from the top of the building, the subject is the glorified Messiah crushing all earthly oppositions by the manifestations of His wrath. In Dan. 2 : 44 the word λικμᾷν is also found λικμήσει πάσας τὰς βασιλειας), strictly : *to winnow*, and hence to scatter to the wind. It is therefore dangerous to encounter this stone, either by dashing against it while it is yet laid on the ground, as Israel is doing, or whether, when it shall be raised to the top of the building, men provoke it to fall on their own head, as the other nations shall one day do A new deliberation among the rulers follows this terrible shock (ver. 19). But fear of the people restrains them. There is a correspondence between the two καί before ἐφοβήθησαν and before ἐζήτησαν. The two feelings, *fearing* and *seeking* (to put Him to death), struggle within their heart. The *for* at the end of the verse bears on the first proposition ; and the πρὸς αὐτούς signifies, *with a view to them* (ver. 9, 19 : 9). In Matthew there occurs here the parable of the great supper. It is hardly probable that Jesus heaped up at one time so many figures of the same kind. The association of ideas which led the evangelist to insert the parable here is sufficiently obvious.

4. *The Question of the Pharisees :* 20 : 20–26.—The official question of the Sanhedrim served only to prepare a triumph for Jesus. From this time forth the different parties make attempts on Him separately, and that by means of captious questions adroitly prepared.

Vers. 20–26.* The introduction to this narrative presents in our three Syn. (Matt. 22 : 15 ; Mark 12 : 13) some marked shades of meaning. The simplest form is that of Luke. The priests and scribes (ver. 19) suborn certain parties, who, affecting a scruple of conscience (" feigning themselves just men"), interrogate Jesus as to whether it is lawful to pay tribute to Gentile authorities. The snare was this : Did Jesus answer in the affirmative? It was a means of destroying His influence with the people by stigmatizing His Messianic pretensions. Did He reply in the negative? He fell as a rebel into the hands of the Roman governor, who would make short work with Him. This is brought out in ver. 20 by the emphatic accumulation of the terms ἀρχή, ἐξουσία, military power and judicial authority. Once given over to that power, Jesus would be in good hands, and the Sanhedrim would have no more concern about the favor with which the people surrounded Him. Λόγου and αὐτοῦ ought both to be taken, notwithstanding Bleek's scruples, as immediately dependent on ἐπιλάβωνται : " To take Him by surprise, and to catch a word from Him by surprise." According to Mark and Matthew, the Pharisees in this case united with the Herodians. Bleek thinks that the bond of union between the one party, fanatical zealots for national independence, and the other, devoted partisans of Herod's throne, was common antipathy to foreign domination. The presence of the Herodians was intended to encourage Jesus to answer in the negative, and so to put Himself in conflict with Pilate. But the attitude of the Herodians toward the Roman power was totally different from Bleek's view of it. The Herods had rather planted themselves in Israel as the vassals of Cæsar. The Herodians, says M. Reuss, " were the Jews who had taken the

* Ver. 20. C. K. Γ. 25 Mnn., λογον ; D., των λογων ; L., λογους instead of λογου. ℵ. B. C. D. L., ωστε instead of εις το. Ver. 22. ℵ. A. B. L. 6 Mnn., ημας instead of ημιν. Ver. 23. ℵ. B. L. 6 Mnn. omit τι με πειραζετε. Ver. 24. 7 Mjj. 30 Mnn., δειξατε instead of επιδειξατε. ℵ. C. L. 50 Mnn. add οι δε εδειξαν και ειπεν after δηναριον (taken from the parall.). ℵ. B. L. Syr$^{sch.}$, οι δε instead of αποκριθεντες δε. Ver. 25. ℵ. B. L. 7 Mnn., προς αυτους instead of αυτοις. Ver. 26. ℵ. B. L., του ρηματος instead of αυτου ρηματος.

side of the family of Herod against the patriots," that is to say, against the Pharisees.* We have therefore here, what so often occurs in history, a coalition of two hostile parties, with the view of crushing a third, dangerous to both. In Galilee we have already seen a similar combination (Mark 3 : 6 ; Luke 13 : 31, 32). There was a perfectly good reason for it in this case. If the answer of Jesus required to be denounced to the people, this task would fall to the Pharisees, who stood well with the multitude. If, on the contrary, it was necessary to go to Pilate, the Herodians would take this part, so disagreeable to the Pharisees. According to Matthew (ver. 16), the heads of the pharisaic party took care to keep aloof. They attacked Him first through some of their disciples. In reality, their alliance with the Herodians compromised those well-known defenders of national independence.

The address of the emissaries is variously rendered in our three Gospels. Ὀρθῶς : without deviating from the straight line. Λέγειν and διδάσκειν, *to say* and *to teach*, differ as pronouncing on a question and stating the grounds of the decision. The Hebraistic phrase λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον, which must have been a frightful barbarism to Greek ears (*to take the countenance*, for : to accept men's persons), is found only in Luke. It would therefore be himself, if he was copying Matthew or Mark, who had added it at his own hand—he who was writing for Greek readers ! Ὁδὸς Θεοῦ, *the way of God*, denotes the straight theocratic line traced out by the law, without regard to accomplished facts or political necessities. They think by their phrases to render it impossible for Him to recoil. There was, in reality—and this is what formed the apparently insurmountable difficulty of the question—a contradiction between the pure theocratic standard and the actual state of things. The normal condition was the autonomy of God's people—normal because founded on the divine law, and as such, sacred in the eyes of Jesus. The actual state of things was the subjection of the Jews to the Romans—a providential situation, and as such, not less evidently willed by God. How was this contradiction to be got over ? Judas the Galilean, rejecting the fact, had declared himself for the right ; he had perished. This was the fate to which the rulers wished to drive Jesus. And if He recoiled, if He accepted the fact, was this not to deny the right, the legal standard, Moses, God Himself ?

Is it lawful for us (ver. 22) ? They have a scruple of conscience ! Jesus at once discerns the malicious plot which is at the bottom of the question ; He feels that never was a more dangerous snare laid for Him. But there is in the simplicity of the dove a skill which enables it to escape from the best laid string of the fowler. What made the difficulty of the question was the almost entire fusion of the two domains, the religious and political, in the Old Covenant. Jesus, therefore, has now to distinguish those two spheres, which the course of Israelitish history has in fact separated and even contrasted, so that He may not be drawn into applying to the one the absolute standard which belongs only to the other. Israel should depend only on God, assuredly, but that in the religious domain. In the political sphere, God may be pleased to put it for a time in a state of dependence on a human power, as had formerly happened in their times of captivity, as is the case at present in relation to Cæsar. Did not even the theocratic constitution itself distinguish between the tribute to be paid to the king and the dues to be paid to the priests and the temple ? This legal distinction became only more precise and emphatic when the sceptre fell into Gentile hands. What remained to be said was not God *or* Cæsar, but rather, God *and* Cæsar,

* Herzog's " Encyclopedie," t. xiii. p. 291.

each in his own sphere. The Gentile money which passed current in Israel attested the providential fact of the establishment of the Roman dominion, and of the acceptance of that state of things by the theocratic people. *Ubicunque numisma regis alicujus obtinet, illic incolæ regem istum pro domino agnoscunt*, says the famous Jewish doctor Maimonides (quoted by Bleek). The piece of Roman money which Jesus calls His adversaries to show, establishes by the image and inscription which it bears the existence of this foreign power in the political and lower sphere of the theocratic life : it is to this sphere that the payment of tribute belongs ; the debt should therefore be discharged. But above this sphere there is that of the religious life which has God for its object. This sphere is fully reserved by the answer of Jesus ; and He declares that all its obligations can be fulfilled, without in the least doing violence to the duties of the other. He accepts with submission the actual condition, while reserving fidelity to Him who can re establish the normal condition as soon as it shall seem good to Him. Jesus Himself had never felt the least contradiction between those two orders of duties ; and it is simply from His own pure consciousness that He derives this admirable solution. The word ἀπόδοτε, *render*, implies the notion of moral duty toward Cæsar, quite as much as toward God. De Wette is therefore certainly mistaken here in limiting the notion of obligation to the things which are God's, and applying merely the notion of utility to the things which are Cæsar's. St. Paul understood the thought of Jesus better, when he wrote to the Romans (13 : 1 *et seq.*) "Be subject to the powers . . . not only from fear of punishment, but also for conscience' sake." Comp. 1 Tim. 2 : 1 *et seq.* ; 1 Pet. 2 : 13 *et seq.* Dependence on God does not exclude, but involves, not only many personal duties, but the various external and providential relations of dependence in which the Christian may find himself placed, even that of slavery (1 Cor. 7 : 22).* As to theocratic independence, Jesus knew well that the way to regain it was not to violate the duty of submission to Cæsar by a revolutionary shaking off of his yoke, but to return to the faithful fulfilment of all duties toward God. To render to God what is God's, was the way for the people of God to obtain anew David instead of Cæsar as their Lord. Who could find a word to condemn in this solution? To the Pharisees, the *Render unto Cæsar ;* to the Herodians, the *Render unto God*. Each carries away his own lesson ; Jesus alone issues triumphantly from the ordeal which was to have destroyed Him.

5. *The Question of the Sadducees :* 20 : 27-40.—We know positively from Josephus that the Sadducees denied at once the resurrection of the body, the immortality of the soul, and all retribution after death (Antiq. xviii. 1. 4 ; Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 14). It was not that they rejected either the O. T. in general, or any of its parts. How, in that case, could they have sat in the Sanhedrim, and filled the priesthood?† Probably they did not find personal immortality taught clearly enough in the books of Moses ; and as to the prophetic books, they ascribed to them only secondary authority.‡

* [According to the interpretation, "use servitude rather." See Lange's Comment. on the passage.—TRANS.]

† There is wide difference of view on this matter. Some of the Fathers and many moderns hold that the Sadducees denied all but the Pentateuch. Others, like our author, reject this view. May not both be right? They did not openly impugn any of the Old Testament, but they tacitly ignored what they did not like. Are there no successors to them in this eclecticism?—J. H.

‡ Read on this subject the excellent treatise of M. Reuss, Herzog's "Encyclopedie," t. xiii. p. 289 *et seq.*

Vers. 27–33.* *The Question.*—The Sadducees, starting from the Levirate law given by Moses (Deut. 25 : 5), agreeably to a patriarchal usage (Gen. 38) which is still allowed by many Eastern peoples, seek to cover with ridicule the idea of a resurrection; ἀντιλέγοντες: *who oppose* (ἀντί), *maintaining that* (λέγοντες). The whole statement vers. 29–33 has in it a touch of sarcasm.

Vers. 34–40.† *The Answer.*—This answer is preceded in Matthew and Mark by a severe rebuke, whereby Jesus makes His questioners aware of the gross spiritual ignorance involved in such a question as theirs. The answer of Jesus has also a sarcastic character. Those accumulated verbs, γαμεῖν, ἐκγαμίζεσθαι, especially with the frequentative γαμίσκεσθαι or ἐκγαμίσκεσθαι, throw a shade of contempt over that whole worldly train, above which the Sadducean mind is incapable of rising. Although from a moral point of view the αἰὼν μέλλων, *the world to come*, has already begun with the coming of Christ, from a physical point of view, the present world is prolonged till the resurrection of the body, which is to coincide with the restitution of all things. The resurrection from the dead is very evidently, in this place, not the resurrection of the dead in general. What is referred to is a special privilege granted only to the faithful (*which shall be accounted worthy;* comp. 14 : 14; the resurrection of the just, and Phil. 3 : 11).‡

The first *for*, ver. 36, indicates a casual relation between the cessation of marriage, ver. 35, and that of death, ver. 36. The object of marriage is to preserve the human species, to which otherwise death would soon put an end; and this constitution must last till the number of the elect whom God will gather in is completed. While the *for* makes the cessation of death to be the cause of the cessation of marriage, the particle οὔτε, *neither*, brings out the analogy which exists between those two facts. The reading οὐδέ is less supported. Jesus does not say (ver. 36) that glorified men are angels—angels and men are of two different natures, the one cannot be transformed into the other—but that they are equal with the angels, and that in two respects: no death, and no marriage. Jesus therefore ascribes a body to the angels, exempt from the difference of sex. This positive teaching about the existence and nature of angels is purposely addressed by Jesus to the Sadducees, because, according to Acts 23 : 8, this party denied the existence of those beings. Jesus calls the raised ones *children of God*, and explains the title by that of *children of the resurrection*. Men on the earth are sons of one another; each of the raised ones is directly a child of God, because his body is an immediate work of divine omnipotence. It thus resembles that of the angels, whose body also proceeds directly from the power of the Creator—a fact which explains the name *sons of God*, by which they are designated in the O. T. The Mosaic command could not therefore form an objection to the doctrine of the resurrection

* Ver. 27. ℵ. B. C. D. L. some Mnn. Syr., λεγοντες instead of αντιλεγοντες. Ver. 28. ℵ[a] B. L. P. some Mnn. Syr. It[aliq.] Vg., η instead of αποθανη. Ver. 30. ℵ. B. D L., και ο δευτερος instead of και: ελαβεν ο δευτ. τ. γυν. και ουτος απεθ. ατεκνος. Ver. 31 12 Mjj. omit και before ου. Ver. 32. ℵ. B. D. L. some Mnn. Syr. omit παντων. Ver. 33. ℵ. D. G. L. some Mnn. Syr. It., εσται instead of γινεται.

† Ver. 34. ℵ. B. D. L. 2 Mnn. Syr. It. Vg. omit αποκριθεις (which is taken from the parallels). ℵ. B. L. 8 Mnn., γαμισκονται instead of εκγαμιζονται. Ver. 36. A. B. D. L. P., ουδε instead of ουτε. Ver. 37. Marcion omitted vers. 37 and 38.

‡ This view is not held by most commentators. The words do not require it, and the question of the Sadducees did not contemplate one class of the dead. They opposed the idea of future life, retribution, and the raising of any from the dead. Why reply to them by a statement regarding one portion of the dead?—J. H.

rightly understood. Jesus now takes the offensive, and proves by that very Moses whom they had been opposing to Him (*καί, even*, before Moses), the indisputable truth of the doctrine (vers. 37 and 38). The scribes of the pharisaic party had probably often tried to discover such a proof; but it was necessary to dig deeply in the mine to extract from it this diamond.

In the phrase *ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου, ἐπί* denotes the place where the account of the bush is found. The choice of the word *μηνύω, to give to understand*, shows that Jesus distinguishes perfectly between an express declaration which does not exist, and an indication such as that which He proceeds to cite. He means simply, that if Moses had not had the idea of immortality, he would not have expressed himself as he does. When Moses put into the mouth of God the designation, *God of Abraham*, etc., many generations had passed since the three patriarchs lived here below; and yet God still calls Himself their God. God cannot be the God of a being who does not exist. Therefore, in Him they live. Mark the absence of the article before the words *νεκρῶν* and *ζώντων*: *a God of dead, of living beings*. In Plato, it is their participation in the idea which guarantees existence; in the kingdom of God, it is their relation to God Himself. The dative *αὐτῷ, to Him*, implies a contrast to *to us*, to whom the dead are as though they were not. Their existence and activity are entirely concentrated in their relation to God. *All;* not only the three patriarchs. The *for* bears on the word *living*. "For they live, really dead though they are to us."

This prompt and sublime answer filled with admiration the scribes who had so often sought this decisive word in Moses without finding it; they cannot restrain themselves from testifying their joyful surprise. Aware from this time forth that every snare laid for Him will be the occasion for a glorious manifestation of His wisdom, they give up this sort of attack (ver. 40).

6. *The Question of Jesus:* 20 : 41–44.—Vers. 41–44.* Matthew and Mark place here the question of a scribe on the great commandment of the law. This question was suggested to the man, as we see from Mark 12 : 28, by the admiration which filled him at the answers which he had just heard. According to Matthew, he wished yet again to put the wisdom of Jesus to the proof (*πειράζων αὐτον*, Matt. 22 · 35). Either Luke did not know this narrative, or he omitted it because he had related one entirely similar, 10 : 25 *et seq.*

At the close of this spiritual tournament, Jesus in His turn throws down a challenge to His adversaries. Was it to give them difficulty for difficulty, entanglement for entanglement? No; the similar question which He had put to them, ver. 4, has proved to us that Jesus was acting in a wholly different spirit. What, then, was His intention? He had just announced His death, and pointed out the authors of it (parable of the husbandmen). Now He was not ignorant what the charge would be which they would use against Him. He would be condemned as a blasphemer, and that for having called Himself the *Son of God* (John 5 : 18, 10 : 33; Matt. 26 : 65). And as He was not ignorant that before such a tribunal it would be impossible for Him to plead His cause in peace, He demonstrates beforehand, in presence of the whole people, and by the Old Testament, the divinity of the Messiah, thus sweeping away from the Old Testament standpoint itself the accusation of blasphemy which was to form the pretext for His condemnation. The three Syn. have preserved, with slight differences, this remarkable saying, which, with Luke 10 : 21, 22, and some

* Ver. 41. A. K. M. II. 20 Mnn. add *τινες* after *λεγουσι*. Ver. 42. ℵ. B. L. R. some Mnn., *αυτος γαρ* instead of *και αυτος*.

other passages, forms the bond of union between the teaching of Jesus in those Gospels, and all that is affirmed of His person in that of John. If it is true that Jesus applied to Himself the title of David's *Lord*, with which this king addressed the Messiah in Ps. 110, the consciousness of His divinity is implied in this title as certainly as in any declaration whatever of the fourth Gospel.

According to Luke, it is to the scribes, according to Matthew (22 : 41), to the Pharisees, that the following question is addressed. Mark names no one. The three narratives differ likewise slightly in the form of the question : "How say they?" (Luke) ; "How say the scribes?" (Mark). In Matthew, Jesus declares to the Pharisees at the same time the doctrine of the Davidic sonship of the Messiah—very natural diversities if they arise from a tradition which had taken various forms, but inexplicable if they are intentional, as they must be, supposing the use of one and the same written source. The Alex. read : "For he himself . . ;" that is to say : "there is room to put this question ; for . . ." The Byz. : "And (nevertheless) he himself hath said . . ." Luke says : *in the book of Psalms ;* Matthew : *by the Spirit ;* Mark : *by the Holy Spirit.* The non-Messianic explanations of Ps. 110 are the masterpiece of rationalistic arbitrariness. They begin by giving to לדוד the meaning : "addressed to David," instead of "composed by David," contrary to the uniform sense of the ל *auctoris* in the titles of the Psalms, and that to make David the subject of the Psalm, which would be impossible if he were its author (Ewald). And as this interpretation turns out to be untenable, for David never was a priest (ver. 4 : "Thou art a priest for ever"), they transfer the composition of the Psalm to the age of the Maccabees, and suppose it addressed by some author or other to Jonathan, the brother of Judas Maccabeus, of the priestly race. This person, who never even bore the title of king, is the man whom an unknown flatterer is supposed, according to Hitzig, to celebrate as seated at Jehovah's right hand ! It is impossible to cast a glance at the contents of the Psalm without recognizing its directly Messianic bearing : 1. A Lord of David ; 2. Raised to Jehovah's throne, that is to say, to participation in omnipotence ; 3. Setting out from Zion on the conquest of the world, overthrowing the kings of the earth (ver. 4), judging the nations (ver. 5), and that by means of an army of priests clothed in their sacerdotal garments (ver. 3) ; 4. Himself at once a priest and a king, like Melchisedec before Him. The law, by placing the kingly power in the tribe of Judah, and the priesthood in that of Levi, had raised an insurmountable barrier between those two offices. This separation David must often have felt with pain. Uzziah attempted to do away with it ; but he was immediately visited with punishment. It was reserved for the Messiah alone, at the close of the theocracy, to reproduce the sublime type of the King-Priest, presented at the date of its origin in the person of Melchisedec. Comp. on the future reunion of those two offices in the Messiah, the wonderful prophecy of Zech. 6 : 9–15. Ps. 110, besides its evidently prophetic bearing, possesses otherwise all the characteristics of David's compositions : a conciseness which is forcible and obscure ; brilliancy and freshness in the images ; grandeur and richness of intuition. It was from the words : *Sit thou at my right hand*, that Jesus took His answer to the adjuration of the high priest in the judgment scene (Matt. 26 : 64) : "Henceforth shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power." With what a look of severity, turned upon His adversaries at the very moment when He quoted this Psalm before all the people, must He have accompanied this declaration of Jehovah to the Messiah : "until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool."

To answer satisfactorily the question of ver. 44, put by Jesus, it was absolutely necessary to introduce the idea of the divinity of the Messiah, which is the soul of the entire Old Testament. Isaiah called the Son born to us: *Wonderful, mighty God* (Isa. 9 : 5). Micah had distinguished His historic birth at Bethlehem, and His prehistoric birth *from everlasting* (5 : 2). Malachi had called the Messiah, "Adonai coming to His temple" (3 : 1). There was in the whole of the Old Testament, from the patriarchal theophanies down to the latest prophetic visions, a constant current toward the incarnation as the goal of all those revelations. The appearance of the Messiah presents itself more and more clearly to the view of the prophets as the perfect theophany, the final coming of Jehovah. No doubt, since the exile, exclusive zeal for monotheism had diverted Jewish theology from this normal direction. This is the fact which Jesus sets before its representatives in that so profound argument of His, John 10 : 34–38. It was exactly in this way that Rabbinical monotheism had become petrified and transformed into a dead theism. Jesus has taken up the broken thread of the living theology of the prophets. Such is the explanation of His present question. To resolve it, the scribes would have required to plunge again into the fresh current of the ancient theocratic aspirations: The descendant promised to David (2 Sam. 7 : 16) will be nothing less than Adonai coming to His temple (Mal. 3 : 1); to His human birth at Bethlehem there corresponds His eternal origin in God (Mic. 5 . 2): such only is the reconciliation of the two titles *son* and *Lord* of David given to the person of the Messiah.

The meaning and appropriateness of Jesus' question appear to us equally manifest. It has been sought, however, to explain it otherwise.

1. Some think that Jesus argues, from the fact that Messiah is to be David's *Lord*, to prove that He cannot be *his descendant*. For it is incongruous, say they, that an ancestor should call his descendant his Lord. According to this meaning it must be admitted that Jesus Himself knew very well that He did not descend from David, although among the people they ignorantly gave Him the title *son of David*, because they took Him for the Messiah. The Christians, it is said, yielded at a later period to the popular Jewish instinct; and to satisfy it *invented* the two genealogies which seem to establish the Davidic descent of Jesus (Schenkel). But, (*a*) In this case, Jesus would have acted, as Keim observes, in a manner extremely imprudent, by Himself raising a question which more than any other might have prejudiced His standing with the people. "The character *son of David* could not be wanting to Him who thus publicly made it a subject of discussion" (Keim). (*b*) It would not only be the forgers, the authors of the two genealogical documents preserved by Matthew and Luke, who had admitted and propagated this late error; it would also mean the author of the Apocalypse (22 : 16: "I am the root and *offspring* of David"). St. Paul himself would be guilty—he who should least of all have been inclined to make such a concession to the Judaizing party (Rom. 1 : 3: "of the seed of David according to the flesh;" 2 Tim. 2 : 8: "of the seed of David.") The whole Church must thus have connived at this falsehood, or given in to this error, and that despite of the express protestation of Jesus Himself in our passage, and without any attempt on the part of our Lord's adversaries to show up the error or falsehood of this assertion! (*c*) The argument thus understood would prove far too much; the rationalists themselves should beware of ascribing to Jesus so gross a want of logic as it would imply. If it was dishonoring to David to call any one whatsoever of his descendants his Lord, why would it be less so for him to give this title to that descendant of Abraham who should be the Messiah? Was not the family of David the noblest, the most illustrious of Israelitish families? The reasoning of Jesus would logically end in proving that the Messiah could not be an Israelite, or even a man! (*d*) Jesus would thus have put Himself in contradiction to the whole Old Testament which represented the Christ as being born of the family of David (2 Sam. 7; Ps. 132 : 17; Isa. 9 : 5, 6). (*e*) Luke would also be in contradiction with himself, for he expressly makes

Jesus descend from David (1 : 32, 69). (*f*) How, finally, could Jesus have contented Himself with protesting so indirectly against this attribute son of David ascribed to Him by the multitude, if He had known that He did not possess it?

2. According to M. Colani also, Jesus means that the Messiah is not the *son of David*, but in this purely moral sense, that He is not the heir of his temporal power; that His kingdom is of a higher nature than David's earthly kingdom. But, (*a*) It is wholly opposed to the simple and rational meaning of the term *son of David*, not to refer it to sonship properly so called, but to make it signify a temporal king *like David*. (*b*) It would be necessary to admit that the evangelist did not himself understand the meaning of this saying, or that he contradicts himself—he who puts into the mouth of the angel the declaration, 1 : 32 : "The Lord shall give unto Him the *throne* of *His father* David" (comp. ver. 69).

3. Keim admits the natural meaning of the term *Son*. He places the notion of spiritual kingship not in this term, but in that of *David's Lord*. "The physical descent of Jesus from David is of no moment; His kingdom is not a repetition of David's. From the bosom of the heavenly glory to which He is raised, He bestows spiritual blessings on men. None, therefore, should take offence at His present poverty." But, (*a*) If that is the whole problem, the problem vanishes; for there is not the least difficulty in admitting that a descendant may be raised to a height surpassing that of his ancestor. There is no serious difficulty, if the term Lord does not include the notion of a *sonship* superior to that which is implied in the title *son of David*. (*b*) So thoroughly is this our Lord's view, that in Mark the question put by Him stands thus: "David calls Him his Lord; *how, then, is He his son?*" In Keim's sense, Jesus should have said: "David calls Him his son; *how, then, is He his Lord?*" In the form of Matthew (the Gospel to which Keim uniformly gives the preference, and to which alone he ascribes any real value), the true point of the question is still more clearly put: "Whose son is He?" The problem is evidently, therefore, the *Davidic sonship* of Jesus, as an undeniable fact, and yet apparently contradictory to another sonship implied in the term David's Lord. Finally, (*c*) If it was merely the spiritual nature of His kingdom which Jesus meant to teach, as Colani and Keim allege in their two different interpretations, there were many simpler and clearer ways of doing so, than the ambiguous and complicated method which on their supposition He must have employed here. The question put by Jesus would be nothing but a play of wit, unworthy of Himself and of the solemnity of the occasion.

4. According to Volkmar, this whole piece is a pure invention of Mark, the primitive evangelist, who, by putting this question in the mouth of Jesus, skilfully answered this Rabbinical objection: Jesus did not present Himself to the world either as David's descendant or as His glorious successor; consequently He cannot be the Messiah, for the O. T. makes Messiah the son of David. Mark answered by the mouth of Jesus: No; it is impossible that the O. T. could have meant to make Messiah the son of David, for according to Ps. 110 the Messiah was to be his Lord. But, (*a*) It would follow therefrom, as Volkmar acknowledges, that in the time of Jesus none had regarded Him as the descendant of David. Now the acclamations of the multitude on the day of Palms, the address of the woman of Canaan, that of Bartimeus, and all the other like passages, prove on the contrary, that the Davidic sonship of Jesus was a generally admitted fact. (*b*) How was it that the scribes never protested against the Messianic pretensions of Jesus, especially on the occasion of His trial before the Sanhedrim, if His attitude son of David had not been a notorious fact? (*c*) The Davidic descent of the family of Jesus was so well known that the Emperor Domitian summoned the nephews of Jesus, the sons of Jude His brother, to Rome, under the designation of sons of David. (*d*) St. Paul, in the year 59, positively teaches the Davidic descent of Jesus (Rom. 1 : 3). And Mark, the *Pauline* (according to Volkmar), denied to Jesus this same sonship in 73 (the date, according to Volkmar, of Mark's composition), by a reasoning *ad hoc!* Still more, Luke himself, that Pauline of the purest water, reproduces Mark's express denial, without troubling himself about the positive teaching of Paul! Volkmar attempts to elude the force of this argument by maintaining that Paul's saying in the Epistle to the Romans is only a concession made by him to the Judeo-Christian party! To the objection taken from the genealogy of Jesus (Luke 3 : 23, *et seq.*), Volkmar auda-

ciously replies that Luke mentions it only to set it aside ("*um sie zu illudiren*"). And yet this same Luke, as we have seen, expressly asserts this sonship (1 : 32 and 69). (*e*) Let us add a last discovery of Volkmar's : Matthew found it useful, in the interest of the Judeo-Christian party, to accept in spite of Mark the idea of the Davidic descent of Jesus as he found it contained in Luke (in that genealogical document which Luke had quoted only to set aside) ! Only, to glorify Jesus the more, he substituted *at his own hand*, for the obscure branch of Nathan (Luke's genealogy), the royal and much more glorious line of Solomon (Matthew's).

Thus our sacred writers manipulate history to suit their interest or caprice ! Instead of the artless simplicity which moves us in their writings, we find in them device opposed to device and falsehood to falsehood ! Be it ours to stand aloof from such saturnalia of criticism !

Our interpretation, the only natural one in the context, is confirmed : (1) By those expressions in the Apocalypse : the *root* and *offspring* of David—expressions which correspond to those of *Lord* and *son* of this king ; (2) by Paul s twofold declaration, "*made of the seed of David* according to the flesh [David's son], and declared to be the Son of God with power since His resurrection, according to the spirit of holiness [David's Lord] ;" (3) by the silence of Jesus at the time of His condemnation. This question, put in the presence of all the people to the conscience of His judges, had answered beforehand the accusation of blasphemy raised against Him. Such was the practical end which Jesus had in view, when with this question He closed this decisive passage of arms.

7. *The Warning against the Scribes :* 20 : 45-47.—Vers. 45–47.* On the field of battle where the scribes have just been beaten, Jesus judges them. This short discourse, like its parallel Mark 12 : 38-40, is the summary of the great discourse Matt. 23, wherein Jesus pronounced His woe on the scribes and Pharisees, and which may be called the judgment of the theocratic authorities. It is the prelude to the great eschatological discourse which follows (the judgment of Jerusalem, of the Church, and of the world, Matt. 24 and 25). In the discourse Matt. 23, two different discourses are combined, of which the one is transmitted to us by Luke (11 : 37 *et seq.*), in a context which leaves nothing to be desired, and the other was really uttered at the time where we find it placed in the first Gospel. We have only an abridgment in Mark and Luke, either because it was found in this form in the documents from which they drew, or because, writing for Gentile readers, they deemed it unnecessary to transmit it to them in whole. Θελόντων : who take their pleasure in. There are two ways of explaining the spoliations referred to in the words : *devouring widows' houses*. Either they extorted considerable presents from pious women, under pretext of interceding for them—this sense would best agree with the sequel, especially with the reading προσευχόμενοι ; or what is more natural and piquant, by the ambiguity of the word *eat up*, Jesus alludes to the sumptuous feasts provided for them by those women, while they filled the office of directors of the conscience ; in both senses : the Tartuffes of the period. The word πρόφασις, strictly *pretext*, signifies secondarily, *show*. The words *greater damnation*, include in an abridged form all the *οὐαί, woes!* of Matthew.

8. *The Widow's Alms :* 21 : 1-4.—Vers. 1–4.† This piece is wanting in Matthew. Why would he have rejected it, if, according to Holtzmann's view, he had before him the document from which the other two have taken it ? According to Mark

* Ver. 45. B. D. omit αυτου after μαθηταις. Ver. 47. D. P. R. some Mnn. Syr. Ilplerique, Vg., προσευχομενοι instead of προσευχονται.

† Ver 2. 9 Mjj. several Mnn , τινα και instead of και τινα. 9 Mjj. several Mnn. omit και. Ver. 4. ℵ. B. L. X. 4 Mnn. Syrcur. omit του Θεου after δωρα.

(12 : 41–44), Jesus, probably worn out with the preceding scene, sat down. In the court of the women there were placed, according to the Talmud (tr. Schekalim, vi. 1, 5, 13), thirteen coffers with horn-shaped orifices ; whence their name שופרות. They were called γαζοφυλάκια, *treasuries*. This name in the sing. designated the locality as a whole where those coffers stood (John 8 : 20) ; Josephus, Antiq. xix. 6. 1). This is perhaps the meaning in which the word is used in Mark (5 : 41) : *over against the treasury ;* in Luke it is applied to the coffers themselves. Λεπτόν, *mite :* the smallest coin, probably the eighth part of the as, which was worth from six to eight centimes (from a halfpenny to three farthings). Two λεπτά, therefore, correspond nearly to two centime pieces. Bengel finely remarks on the *two :* "one of which she might have retained." Mark translates this expression into Roman money : "which make a farthing"—a slight detail unknown to Luke, and fitted to throw light on the question where the second Gospel was composed. In the sayings which Jesus addresses to His disciples, His object is to lead their minds to the true appreciation of human actions according to their quality, in opposition to the quantitative appreciation which forms the essence of pharisaism. Such is the meaning of the word : *she hath cast in more ;* in reality, with those two mites she had cast in her heart. The proof (γάρ, ver. 4) is given in what follows : *she hath cast in of her penury all that she had.* Ὑστέρημα, *deficiency*, denotes what the woman had as insufficient for her maintenance. "And of that too little, of that possession which in itself is already a deficiency, she has kept nothing." The word ὑστέρησις in Mark denotes not what the woman *had* as insufficient (ὑστέρημα), but her entire condition, as a state of continued penury. What a contrast to the avarice for which the scribes and Pharisees are upbraided in the preceding piece ! This incident, witnessed by Jesus at such a time, resembles a flower which He comes upon all at once in the desert of official devotion, the sight and perfume of which make Him leap with joy. Such an example is the justification of the beatitudes, Luke 6, as the preceding discourse justifies the οὐαί, *woes*, in the same passage.

THIRD CYCLE.—CHAP. 21 : 5–38.

The Prophecy of the Destruction of Jerusalem.

This piece contains a question put by the disciples (vers. 5–7), the discourse of Jesus in answer to their question (vers. 8–36), and a general view of the last days (vers. 37, 38).

1. *The Question :* vers. 5–7.*—To the preceding declaration, some of the hearers might have objected, that if only such gifts as the widow's had been made in that holy place, those magnificent structures and those rich offerings would not have existed. It was doubtless some such reflection which gave rise to the following conversation. This conversation took place, according to Matthew 24 : 1 and Mark 13 : 1, as Jesus left the temple, and on occasion of an observation made by *His disciples* (Matthew), or by *one of them* (Mark). According to Matthew, this observation was certainly connected with the last words of the previous discourse (not related by Mark and Luke), 23 : 38 : "Your house is left unto you [desolate]." How can it be

* Ver. 5. ℵ. A. D. X., ἀναθεμασιν instead of ἀναθημασιν. Ver. 6. D. L. It^{plerique}, omit α after ταυτα. ℵ B. L. some Mnn. add ωδε after λιθω or λιθον.

asserted that three evangelists, copying the same document, or copying from one another, could differ in such a way?

In the answer of Jesus (ver 6), the words, *ταῦτα ἃ θεωρεῖτε, these things which ye behold*, may be taken interrogatively: "These are the things, are they, which ye are beholding?" Or we may take them as in apposition to *λίθος*, and the subject of *ἀφεθήσεται*, which is more categorical and solemn: "As to these things which ye behold . . . there shall not be left one stone upon another." It was evening (Luke 5 : 37), at the moment perhaps when the setting sun was casting his last rays on the sacred edifice and the holy city. Several critics think that Luke places this discourse also in the temple. But this opinion does not agree either with vers. 5 and 6, where the temple buildings are contemplated by the interlocutors, which supposes them to be at some distance from which they can view them as a whole, or with ver. 7, which conveys the notion of a private conversation between the disciples and the Master. According to Mark (13 : 3), Jesus was seated with Peter, James, John, and Andrew, on the Mount of Olives, over against that wonderful scene. Here is one of those details in which we recognize the recital of an eye-witness, probably Peter. Matthew, while indicating the situation in a way similar to Mark, does not, any more than Luke, name the four disciples present. Luke and Matthew would certainly not have omitted such a circumstance, if they had copied Mark; as, on the contrary, Mark would not have added it at his own hand, if he had compiled from the text of the other two.

The form of the disciples' question, ver. 7, differs in Luke and Mark, but the sense is the same: the question in both refers simply to the time of the destruction of the temple, and to the sign by which it shall be announced. It is, no doubt, possible the disciples more or less confounded this catastrophe with the event of the Parousia; but the text does not say so. It is quite otherwise in Matthew; according to him, the question bears expressly on those two points combined: the time of the destruction of the temple, and the sign of the coming of Christ. Luke and Matthew each give the following discourse in a manner which is in keeping with their mode of expressing the question which gives rise to it. In Luke, this discourse contemplates exclusively the destruction of Jerusalem. If mention is made of the end of the world (vers. 25–27), it is only in passing, and as the result of an association of ideas which will be easily explained. The Parousia in itself had been previously treated of by Luke in a special discourse called forth by a question of the Pharisees (chap. 17). On his side, Matthew combines in the following discourse the two subjects indicated in the question, as he has expressed it; and he unites them in so intimate a way, that all attempts to separate them in the text, from Chrysostom to Ebrard and Meyer, have broken down. Comp. vers. 14 and 22, which can refer to nothing but the Parousia, while the succeeding and preceding context refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, and on the other hand, ver. 34, which points to this latter event, while all that precedes and follows this verse applies to the Parousia. The construction attempted by Gess is this: 1. From vers. 4–14, the general signs preceding the Parousia, that believers may not be led to expect this event too soon; 2. From vers. 15–28, the destruction of the temple as a sign to be joined to those precursive signs; 3. Vers. 29–31, the Parousia itself. But (*a*) this general order is far from natural. What has the destruction of the temple to do after the passage vers. 4–14, which (Gess acknowledges) supposes it consummated long ago? The piece (No. 2) on the destruction of Jerusalem is evidently out of place between the description of the signs of the

Parousia (No. 1) and that of the Parousia itself (No. 3). (*b*) This division cannot be carried out into detail : ver. 22, which Gess is obliged to refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, can apply only to the Parousia. And the "all these things" of ver. 34, which he restricts to the destruction of Jerusalem and the first preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles, as first signs of the Parousia, has evidently a much wider scope in the evangelist's view. It must therefore be admitted, either that Jesus Himself confounded the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world, and that those two events formed, in His judgment, one and the same catastrophe, or that two distinct discourses uttered by Him on two different occasions appear in Matthew united in one. Different expedients have been used to save the accuracy of Matthew's account, without prejudice to the Saviour's infallibility. It has been supposed that the description of the Parousia, Matt. 24, refers exclusively to the invisible return of Jesus to destroy Jerusalem. This explanation is incompatible with the text, especially vers. 29–31. It has also been alleged that in the prophetic perspective the final coming of the Messiah appeared to the view of Jesus as in immediate connection with His return to judge Israel. But (*a*) this hypothesis does not at all attain the end which its authors propose, that of saving our Lord's infallibility. (*b*) Jesus could not affirm here what He elsewhere declares that He does not know (Mark 13 : 32), the time of the Parousia. Even after His resurrection He still refuses to give an answer on this point, which is reserved by the Father in His own power (Acts 1 : 6, 7). (*c*) We can go further, and show that Jesus had a quite opposite view to that of the nearness of His return. While He announces the destruction of Jerusalem as an event to be witnessed by the contemporary generation, He speaks of the Parousia as one which is possibly yet very remote. Consider the expression, ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι, *days will come* (Luke 17 : 22), and the parable of the widow, the meaning of which is, that God will seem to the Church an unjust judge, who for a protracted time refuses to hear her, so that during this time of waiting the faith of many shall give way (18 . 1 *et seq.*). The Master is to return ; but perhaps it will not be till the second, or the third watch, or even till the morning, that He will come (Mark 13 : 35 ; Luke 12 : 38). The great distance at which the capital lies (Luke 19 : 12) can signify nothing else than the considerable space of time which will elapse between the departure of Jesus and His return. In Matt. 25 : 5 the bridegroom tarries much longer than the bridal procession expected ; 24 : 48, the unfaithful servant strengthens himself in his evil-doing by the reflection that his Lord delayeth His coming. Matt. 24 : 14, the gospel is to be preached in all the world and to all the Gentiles (Mark 16 : 15, *to every creature*) : and Matt. 26 : 13, Mary's act is to be published in the whole world before Jesus shall return. In fine, the gospel shall transform humanity not by a magical process, but by slow and profound working, like that of leaven in dough. The kingdom of God will grow on the earth like a tree which proceeds from an imperceptible seed, and which serves in its maturity to shelter the birds of heaven. And Jesus, who knew human nature so deeply, could have imagined that such a work could have been accomplished in less than forty years ! Who can admit it ? The confusion which prevails in this whole discourse, Matt. 24 (as well as in Mark 13), and which distinguishes it from the two distinct discourses of Luke, must therefore be ascribed not to Jesus, but to the account which Matthew used as the basis of his recital.

This confusion in Matthew is probably closely connected with the Judeo-Christian point of view, under the sway of which primitive tradition took its form. In the prophets, the drama of the last days, which closes the eschatological perspective, em-

braces as two events nearly following one another, the judgment whereby Israel is purified by means of the Gentiles, and the punishment of the Gentiles by Jehovah. Preoccupied with this view, the hearers of Jesus easily overlooked in His discourses certain transitions which reserved the interval between those two events usually combined in the O. T. ; and that so much the more, as, on looking at it closely, the destruction of Jerusalem is really the first act of the world's judgment and of the end of the days. The harvest of an early tree announces and inaugurates the general harvest ; so the judgment of Jerusalem is the prelude and even the first act of the judgment of humanity. The Jew has priority in judgment, because he had priority of grace (comp. the two corresponding *πρῶτον*, Rom. 2 . 9, 10). With the judgment on Jerusalem, the hour of the world's judgment has really struck. The present epoch is due to a suspension of the judgment already begun—a suspension the aim of which is to make way for the time of grace which is to be granted to the Gentiles (*καιροὶ ἐθνων, the times of the Gentiles*). The close combination of the destruction of Jerusalem with the end of the world in Matthew, though containing an error in a chronological point of view, rests on a moral idea which is profoundly true.

Thus everything authorizes us to give the preference to Luke's account. 1. Matthew's constant habit of grouping together in one, materials belonging to different discourses ; 2. The precise historical situation which gave rise to the special discourse of chap 17 on the coming of Christ, and which cannot be an invention of Luke ; 3. The established fact, that the confusion which marks the discourse of Matthew was foreign to the mind of Jesus ; 4. Finally, we have a positive witness to the accuracy of Luke ; that is Mark. For though his great eschatological discourse (chap. 13) presents the same confusion as that of Matthew in the question of the disciples which calls it forth, it is completely at one with Luke, and, like him, mentions only one subject, the destruction of Jerusalem.

Might Mark have taken the form of his question from Luke, and that of the discourse from Matthew, as Bleek alleges ? But the incongruity to which such a course would have led would be unworthy of a serious writer. Besides, the form of the question is not the same in Mark as in Luke. Finally, the original details which we have pointed out in Mark, as well as those special and precise details with which his narrative abounds from the day of the entry into Jerusalem onward, do not admit of this supposition. No more can Luke have taken his question from Mark. He would have borrowed at the same time the details peculiar to Mark which he wants, and the form of the question is too well adapted in his Gospel to the contents of the discourse to admit of this supposition. It must therefore be concluded, that if in the compilation of the discourse Mark came under the influence of the tradition to which Matthew's form is due, the form of the question in his Gospel nevertheless remains as a very striking trace of the accuracy of Luke's account. The form of the question in Matthew must have been modified to suit the contents of the discourse ; and thus it is that it has lost its original unity and precision, which are preserved in the other two evangelists.

2. *The Discourse :* vers. 8–36.—The four points treated by Jesus are : 1*st*. The apparent signs, which must not be mistaken for true signs (vers. 8–19) ; 2*d*. The true sign, and the destruction of Jerusalem which will immediately follow it, with the time of the Gentiles which will be connected with it (vers. 20–24) ; 3*d*. The Parousia, which will bring this period to an end (vers. 25–27) ; 4*th*. The practical application (vers. 28–36).

Vers. 8–19.* *The Signs which are not such.*—"But He said, Take heed that ye be not deceived; for many shall come in my name, saying, I am he, and the time draweth near. Go ye not therefore after them. 9. And when ye shall hear of wars and commotions, be not terrified; for these things must first come to pass; but the end cometh not so speedily. 10. Then said He unto them, Nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom. 11. And great earthquakes shall be in divers places, and famines, and pestilences, as well as great and terrible signs from heaven. 12. But above all, they shall lay their hands on you, and persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues, and into prisons, bringing you before kings and rulers for my name's sake. 13. But it shall turn to you for a testimony. 14. Settle it, therefore, in your hearts, not to meditate before what ye shall answer. 15. For I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist. 16. And ye shall be betrayed even by parents, and brethren, and kinsfolks, and friends; and some of you shall they cause to be put to death; 17. And ye shall be hated of all for my name's sake; 18. And there shall not an hair of your head perish. 19. In your patience save ye your lives." The sign to which the question of the apostle refers is not indicated till ver. 20. The signs vers. 8–19 are enumerated solely to put believers on their guard against the decisive value which they might be led to ascribe to them. The vulgar are inclined to look on certain extraordinary events in nature or society as the evidences of some approaching catastrophe. Many events of this kind will happen, Jesus means to say, but without your being warranted yet to conclude that the great event is near, and so to take measures precipitately. The seduction of which Matthew and Mark speak is that which shall be practiced by the false Messiahs. The meaning is probably the same in Luke (γάρ). History, it is true, does not attest the presence of false Messiahs before the destruction of Jerusalem. And those who are most embarrassed by this fact are just our modern critics, who see in this discourse nothing but a prophecy *ab eventu*. They suppose that the author alludes to such men as Judas the Galilean, the Egyptian (Acts 21), Theudas, and others, prudently described by Josephus as mere heads of parties, but who really put forth Messianic pretensions. This assertion is hard to prove. For our part, who see in this discourse a real prophecy, we think that Jesus meant to put believers on their guard against false teachers, such as Simon the magician, of whom there may have been a great number at this period, though he is the only one of whom profane history speaks. The μὴ πτοηθῆναι, *not to let themselves be terrified* (ver. 9), refers to the temptation to a premature emigration. Comp. the opposite ver. 21. Further, it must not be concluded from the political convulsions which shall shake the East that the destruction of Jerusalem is now near.

Jesus had uttered in substance His whole thought in those few words; and He might have passed immediately to the contrast ὅταν δέ, *but when* (ver. 20). Yet He develops the same idea more at length, vers. 10–19. Hence the words in which Luke expressly resumes his report: *Then said he unto them* (ver. 10). This passage, vers. 10–19, might therefore have been inserted here by Luke as a fragment borrowed from

* Ver. 8. ℵ. B. D. L. X. 2 Mnn. Vss. omit *ουν*. Ver. 11. ℵ. B. L. place *και* before *κατα τοπους*. Ver. 12. ℵ. B. D. L. 3 Mnn., *απαγομενους* instead of *αγομενους*. Ver. 14. The mss. are divided between *θεσθε* and *θετε*, between *εις ταις καρδιας* (T. R.) and *εν ταις καρδιαις* (Alex.). Ver. 15. ℵ. B. L. 5 Mnn., *αντιστηναι η αντειπειν* instead of *αντειπειν ουδε αντιστηναι*. Ver. 18. Marcion omitted this verse. Ver. 19. A. B. some Mnn. Syr. It. Vg., *κτησεσθε* instead of *κτησασθε*.

a separate document differing from the source whence he took the rest of the discourse. We should not take the words ἔλεγεν αὐτοις as a parenthetical proposition, and connect τότε with ἐγερθήσεται: "Then said He unto them, One nation shall rise." According to the analogy of Luke's style, we should rather translate: "Then said He unto them, One nation . . ." When to great political commotions there are added certain physical phenomena, the imagination is carried away, and the people become prophets. Jesus puts the Church of Palestine on its guard against this tendency (ver. 11). It is well known that the times which preceded the destruction of Jerusalem were signalized in the East by many calamities, particularly by a dreadful famine which took place under Claudius, and by the earthquake which destroyed Laodicea, Hierapolis, etc., in 67 or 68.* By the *signs from heaven* we are to understand meteors, auroras, eclipses, etc., phenomena to which the vulgar readily attach a prophetic significance.

One of those events which contribute most to inflame fanaticism in a religious community is persecution; thus are connected vers. 12 and 13. Those which are announced will arise either from the Jews (*synagogues*), like that marked by the martyrdoms of Stephen and James, or from the Gentiles (*kings and rulers*), like that to which Paul was exposed in Palestine, or that raised by Nero at Rome. In the phrase, *before all these*, the πρό (*before*) refers to the importance of this sign, not to its time. Meyer denies that πρό can have this meaning; but Passow's dictionary cites a host of examples for it. It is, besides, the only meaning which suits the context. If πρό here signifies *before*, why not speak of the persecutions before the preceding signs? What Jesus means by this word is, that among all those signs, this is the one which might most easily throw His disciples out of the calm attitude in which they ought to persevere. We have translated the passive ἀγομένους by the active (*bringing*). It is hardly possible to render the passive form into English. Holtzmann thinks that Luke here traces after the event, though in the form of prophecy, the picture of those persecutions to which St. Paul was exposed. Can we suppose an evangelist, to whom Jesus is the object of faith, allowing himself deliberately thus to put words into His mouth after his fancy? Bleek applies the word *testimony* (ver. 13) to that which will accrue to the apostles from this proof of their fidelity. It is more natural, having in view the connection with vers. 14 and 15 (*therefore*, ver. 14), to understand by it what they shall themselves render on occasion of their persecution. This idea falls back again into the *Be not terrified:* "All that will only end in giving you the opportunity of glorifying me!" It is the same with vers. 14 and 15, the object of which is to inspire them with the most entire tranquillity of soul in the carrying out of their mission. Jesus charges Himself with everything: ἐγὼ δώσω, *I will give*. The mouth is here the emblem of the perfect ease with which they shall become the organs of the wisdom of Jesus, without the least preparation. The term ἀντειπεῖν, *gainsay*, refers to the fact that their adversaries shall find it impossible to make any valid reply to the defence of the disciples; the word *resist*, to the powerlessness to answer when the disciples, assuming the offensive, shall attack them with the sword of the gospel. In the Alex. reading, which places ἀντιστῆναι first, we must explain ἤ in the sense of *or even*.

To official persecution there shall be added the sufferings of domestic enmity. The

* "The Annals of Tacitus and the Antiquities of Josephus prove famines, earthquakes, etc., in the times of Claudius and Nero and of the Jewish war" (Strauss, "Leben Jesu für d. d. Volk," p. 238).

name of Jesus will open up a gulf between them and their nearest. Ver. 17 is almost identical with John 15 : 21. But even in that case there will be no ground for disquiet. The time will not yet have come for them to quit the accursed city and land. Ver. 18 : "There shall not an hair of your head perish," seems to contradict the close of ver. 16 : "some of you shall perish." This contradiction is explained by the general point of view from which we explain this piece : There shall, indeed, be some individual believers who shall perish in the persecution, but the Christian community of Palestine as a whole shall escape the extermination which will overtake the Jewish people. Their condition is indicated in ver. 19, where this piece is resumed. It is one of patience, that is to say, peaceful waiting for the divine signal, without being drawn aside either by the appeals of a false patriotism or by persecution, or by false signs and anti-Christian seductions. The fut. κτήσεσθε in A. B. is probably a correction of the aor. κτήσασθε (T. R.). The imper. signifies : "Embrace the means which seem the way to lose everything . . . and ye shall save yourselves." Κτᾶσθαι does not mean *to possess* (Ostervald), but *to acquire*. The word suggests that of Jeremiah, *I will give thee thy life for a prey*. And now at length comes the contrast : the time when it will be necessary to leave the passive attitude for that of action (ὅταν δέ, *but when*, ver. 20).

Vers. 20–24.* *The True Sign, and the Catastrophe.*—"But when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. 21. Then let them which are in Judea flee to the mountains ; and let them which are in the city depart out ; and let not them that are in the fields enter thereinto. 22. For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled. 23. But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days ; for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people. 24. And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations ; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Here is the direct answer to the disciples' question : "When . . . and with what sign?" Jesus up till now has been warning believers not to give way to hasty measures. Now He guards them, on the contrary, against the illusions of fanatical Jews, who to the end will cherish the belief that God will not fail to save Jerusalem by a miracle. "By no means, answers Jesus : be assured in that hour that all is over, and that destruction is near and irrevocable." The sign indicated by Luke is the investment of Jerusalem by a hostile army. We see nothing to hinder us from regarding this sign as identical in sense with that announced by Matthew and Mark in Daniel's words (in the LXX.) : *the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place*. Why not understand thereby the Gentile standards planted on the sacred soil which surrounds the holy city? Luke has substituted for the obscure prophetic expression a term more intelligible to Gentiles It has often been concluded from this substitution, that Luke had modified the form of Jesus' saying under the influence of the event itself, and that consequently he had written after the destruction of Jerusalem. But if Jesus really predicted, as we have no doubt He did, the taking of Jerusalem, the substitution of Luke's term for the synonym of Daniel might have been made *before* the event as easily as after. Keim sees in the expression of the other Syn. the announcement of a simple *profanation* of the temple, like that

* Ver. 21. Marcion omitted vers. 21 and 22. Ver. 23. 11 Mjj. 30 Mnn. It. Vg. omit ἐν before τῷ λαῷ, which T. R. reads, with 9 Mjj.

of Antiochus Epiphanes—a prediction which, according to him, was not fulfilled. But in this case we must establish a contradiction between this threat and that of the entire destruction of the temple (Matt. ver. 6 ; Mark, ver. 2), which is purely arbitrary.

This utterance preserved the church of Palestine from the infatuation which, from the beginning of the war, seized upon the whole Jewish nation. Remembering the warning of Jesus of the approach of the Roman armies, the Christians of Judea fled to Pella beyond Jordan, and thus escaped the catastrophe (Eus. "Hist. Eccl." iii. 5, ed. Læmmer). They applied the expression, *the mountains* (ver. 21), to the mountainous plateaus of Gilead. Ver. 21. "Let those who dwell in the capital not remain there, and let those who dwell in the country not take refuge in it." The inhabitants of the country ordinarily seek their safety behind the walls of the capital But in this case, this is the very point on which the whole violence of the storm will break. Ver. 22 gives the reason of this dispensation. Comp. 11 : 50, 51. Ver. 23 exhibits the difficulty of flight in such circumstances. Luke here omits the saying of Matthew about the impossibility of flight *on the Sabbath*, which had no direct application to Gentiles. *The land* should be taken in the restricted sense which we give the word, *the country*. St. Paul seems to allude to the expression, *wrath upon this people*, in Rom. 2 : 5-8 and 1 Thess. 2 : 16. Ver. 24. A million of Jews perished in this war ; 97,000 were led captive to Egypt and the other provinces of the empire (Josephus). The term πατουμένη, *trodden*, denotes more than taking possession ; it is the oppression and contempt which follow conquest ; comp. Rev. 11 · 2. This unnatural state of things will last till the end of the *times of the Gentiles*. What means this expression peculiar to Luke ? According to Meyer and Bleek, nothing more than : the time of Gentile dominion over Jerusalem. But would it not be a tautology to say : Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles until the time of Gentile dominion come to an end ? Then the plural καιροί, *the times*, is not sufficiently accounted for on this view. Neither is the choice of the term καιρός, *the opportunity*, instead of χρόνος, a certain space of time. In the passage 19 : 44, *the time of Israel*, καιρὸς denotes the season when God visits this people with the offer of salvation. According to this analogy, *the times of the Gentiles* should designate the whole period during which God shall approach with His grace the Gentiles who have been hitherto strangers to His kingdom. Comp. 2 Cor. 6 . 2, the expressions καιρὸς δεκτὸς, ἡμέρα σωτηρίας. The plural καιροί, *the times*, corresponds with the plural *the nations ;* the Gentile peoples are called one after another ; hence there arises in this one epoch a plurality of phases.

Modern criticism accuses Luke of having introduced into the discourse of Jesus at his own hand this important idea, which is wanting in Mark and Matthew (Holtzmann, p. 406). This supposition, indeed, is inevitable, if his work is founded on those two writings or on the documents from which they are drawn, the proto-Mark or the *Logia, e.g.* But if this saying is not found in the other two Syn., the thought which it expresses is very clearly implied. Do they not both speak of the preaching of the gospel to all Gentile peoples (Matt. 24 : 14), and of a baptism to be brought to *every creature* (Mark 16 : 15 ; Matt. 28 : 19) ? Such a work demands time. Gess refers also to Mark 12 : 9, Matt. 21 : 43, and 22 : 18, where Jesus declares that the kingdom of God will pass for a time to the Gentiles, and that they will bring forth the fruits thereof, and where He describes the invitation which shall be addressed to them with this view by the servants of the Master (parable of the marriage supper). All this work necessarily supposes a special period in history. Can Jesus have thought of this period as *before* the destruction of Jerusalem ? We have already proved the falsity of this assertion. When, therefore, in Luke Jesus inserts *the times of the Gentiles*

between the destruction of Jerusalem and the Parousia, He says nothing but what is implied in His utterances quoted by the other two Syn., necessary in itself, and consequently in keeping with His real thought. That established, is it not very arbitrary to affect suspicion of Luke's saying in which this idea is positively expressed? This era of the Gentiles was a notion foreign to the O. T. For, in the prophetic view, the end of the theocracy always coincided with that of the present world. We can thus understand how, in the reproduction of Jesus' sayings within the bosom of the Judeo-Christian Church, this notion, unconnected with anything in their past views, could be effaced, and disappear from that oral proclamation of the gospel which determined the form of our two first Syn. In possession of more exact written documents, Luke here, as in so many other cases, restored the sayings of Jesus to their true form. If Jesus, who fixed so exactly the time of the *destruction of Jerusalem* ("this generation shall not pass till . . ."), declared in the same discourse that He did not Himself know *the day of His coming* (Mark 13 : 32), it must infallibly have been because He placed a longer or shorter interval between those two events—an interval which is precisely the period of the Gentiles. Is not this explanation more probable than that which, contrary to all psychological possibility, ascribes to Luke so strange a *license** as that of *deliberately* putting into his Master's mouth sayings which He never uttered?

Vers. 25–27.† *The Parousia.*—"And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars, and in the earth distress of nations with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; 26. Men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth; for the powers of heaven shall be shaken. 27. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory." We have found that the main subject of this discourse was the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem. But how could our Lord close the treatment of this subject, and the mention of the epoch of the Gentiles which was to follow this catastrophe, without terminating by indicating the Parousia, the limit of the prophetic perspective? The mention which He made in passing of this last event, which was to consummate the judgment of the world begun by the former, doubtless contributed to the combination of the two subjects, and to the confounding of the two discourses in tradition. The intermediate idea, therefore, between vers 24 and 25 is this: "And when those times of the period of grace granted to the Gentiles shall be at an end, then there shall be . . .;" then follows the summary description of the Parousia. Those two judgments, that of the theocracy and that of the world, which Luke separates by the times of the Gentiles, are closely connected in Matthew by the εὐθεως, *immediately*, ver. 29, and by the words following: *after the tribulation of those days*, which cannot well refer to anything else than the *great tribulation* mentioned ver. 21, that is to say, to the destruction of Jerusalem (vers. 15–20). In fact, the Parousia is mentioned here by Matthew (ver. 27) only to condemn beforehand the lying revelations of false prophets (vers. 23–26) as to the form of that event. In Mark there is the same connection as in Matthew, though somewhat less absolute, between the destruction of Jerusalem and the Parousia ("in those days," but without the *immediately* of Matthew). The three writers' compilations are, it is easily seen, independent of one another.

Jesus described, 17 : 26–30 and 18 : 8, the state of worldliness into which society and the Church itself would sink in the last times. In the midst of this carnal

* Holtzmann, on occasion of the piece vers. 25–36, says, in speaking of Luke: "Noch weiter geht die Licenz . . ." (p. 237).

† Ver. 25. ℵ. B. D., εσονται instead of εσται. Alex. It. Vg., ηχους instead of ηχουσης (T. R., Byz.).

security, alarming symptoms will all at once proclaim one of those universal revolutions through which our earth has more than once passed. Like a ship creaking in every timber at the moment of its going to pieces, the globe which we inhabit (ἡ οἰκουμένη), and our whole solar system, shall undergo unusual commotions. The moving forces (δυνάμεις), regular in their action till then, shall be as it were set free from their laws by an unknown power; and at the end of this violent but short distress, the world shall see Him appear whose coming shall be like the lightning which shines from one end of heaven to the other (17 : 24). The cloud is here, as almost everywhere in Scripture, the symbol of judgment. The gathering of the elect, placed here by Matthew and Mark, is mentioned by St. Paul, 1 Thess. 4 : 16, 17, 2 Thess. 2 : 1, where the word ἐπισυναγωγή reminds us of the ἐπισυνάγειν of the two evangelists. Is it not a proof of the falsity of that style of criticism which seeks to explain every difference in text between the Syn. by ascribing to them opposite points of view? Ver. 27. It is not said that the Lord shall return to the earth to remain there. This coming can be only a momentary appearance, destined to effect the resurrection of the faithful and the ascension of the entire Church (1 Cor. 15 : 23; Luke 17 : 31–35; 1 Thess. 4 : 16, 17).

Vers. 28-36.* *The Application.*—"When these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh. 29. And He spake to them a parable: Behold the fig-tree, and all the trees; 30. When they now shoot forth, ye see and know of your own selves that summer is now nigh at hand. 31. So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand. 32. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away till all be fulfilled. 33. Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away. 34. But take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares. 35. For as a snare it shall come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth. 36. Watch ye, therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man." Jesus draws practical conclusions from the whole of the preceding discourse: 1. In respect of hope, vers. 28–33; 2. In respect of watchfulness, vers. 34–36.

Vers. 28–33. It might be thought that after this saying relative to the Parousia (vers. 26, 27), which is strictly speaking a digression, Jesus returns to the principal topic of this discourse, the destruction of Jerusalem. The expression: *your deliverance*, would then denote the emancipation of the Judeo-Christian Church by the destruction of the persecuting Jewish power. The coming of the *kingdom of God*, ver. 31, would refer to the propagation of the gospel among the Gentiles; and ver. 32: *this generation shall not pass away*, would thus indicate quite naturally the date of the destruction of Jerusalem. Yet the fact of the Parousia, once mentioned, is too solemn to be treated as a purely accessory idea. The *kingdom of God* seems, therefore, necessarily to denote here rather the final establishment of the Messianic kingdom; and *the deliverance* (ver. 28) should be applied to the definitive emancipation of the Church by the return of the Lord (the deliverance of the widow, 18 : 1–8). *Of yourselves*, ver.

* Ver. 33. ℵ. B. D. L. 3 Mnn., παρελευσονται instead of παρελθωσι (which is taken from Matthew and Mark). Ver. 35. ℵ. B. D., δε instead of ουν. Ver. 36. ℵ. B. L. X. 7 Mnn., κατισχυσητε instead of καταξιωθητε. 15 Mjj. omit ταυτα.

30 : "It is not necessary that an official proclamation announce to the inhabitants of the world that summer is near!" It is about the middle of March that fruits begin to show themselves on the old branches of the spring fig-tree ; they reach maturity before the shooting of the leaves. The first harvest is gathered in June (Keim, iii. p. 206).

Can ver. 32 refer still to the Parousia? But in that case, how are we to explain the expression : *this generation?* Jerome understood by it the human species, Origen and Chrysostom the Christian Church. These explanations are now regarded as forced. That of Dorner and Riggenbach, who take it to mean the Jewish people (applying to their conversion the image of the fig-tree flourishing again, vers. 29, 30), is not much more natural. In this context, where we have to do with a chronological determination ("is nigh," ver. 31), the meaning of γενεά must be *temporal*. Besides, we have the authentic commentary on this saying in Luke 11 : 50, 51, where Jesus declares that it is the very generation which is to shed His blood and that of His messengers, which must suffer, besides, the punishment of all the innocent blood shed since that of Abel down to this last. It is not less false to give to this expression, with the Tübingen school, such an extension that it embraces a period of 70 years (Hilgenfeld), or even of a century (Volkmar) : the duration of a man's life. It has not this meaning among the ancients. In Herod. (2. 142, 7. 171), Heraclitus, and Thuc (1. 14), it denotes a space of from 30 to 40 years. A century counts three generations. The saying of Irenæus respecting the composition of the Apocalypse, wherein he declares "that this vision was seen not long before his epoch, almost within the time of our generation, toward the end of Domitian's reign," does not at all prove the contrary, as Volkmar alleges ; for Irenæus says expressly : σχεδόν, *almost*, well aware that he is extending the reach of the term *generation* beyond its ordinary application. An impartial exegesis, therefore, leaves no doubt that this saying fixes the date of the near destruction of Jerusalem at least the third of a century after the ministry of Jesus. The meaning is : "The generation which shall shed this blood shall not pass away till God require it" (in opposition to all the blood of the ancients which has remained so long unavenged). Πάντα, *all things*, refers to all those events precursive of that catastrophe which are enumerated vers. 8–19, and to the catastrophe itself (20–24). The position of this saying immediately after the preceding verses relative to the Parousia, seems to be in Luke a faint evidence of the influence exercised by that confusion which reigns throughout the whole discourse as related by the other two Syn. There is nothing in that to surprise us. Would not the omission of some word of transition, or the simple displacing of some sentence, suffice to produce this effect? And how many cases of similar transpositions or omissions are to be met with in our Syn.? But if this observation is well founded, it proves that the Gospel of Luke was not composed, any more than the other two, after the destruction of Jerusalem.

Heaven and earth (ver. 33) are contrasted with those magnificent structures which His disciples would have Him to admire (ver. 5) : Here is a very different overthrow from that which they had so much difficulty in believing. This universe, this temple made by the hand of God, passeth away ; one thing remains : the threats and promises of the Master who is speaking to them.

Vers. 34–36. Here, as in chap. 12, the life of the disciples is apparently to be prolonged till the Parousia. The reason is, that that period is ever to remain the point on which the believer's heart should fix (12 : 36) ; and if, by all the generations which

precede the last, this expectation is not realized in its visible form, it has its truth, nevertheless, in the fact of death, that constant individual returning of Jesus which prepares for His general and final advent. The warning ver. 34 refers to the danger of slumbering, arising from the state of the world in the last times, 17 : 26–30. On the last words of the verse, comp. 1 Thess. 5 : 1–7. Ver. 35. The image is that of a net which all at once incloses a covey of birds peacefully settled in a field. *To watch* (ver. 36) is the emblem of constant expectation. With expectation prayer is naturally conjoined under the influence of that grave feeling which is produced by the imminence of the expected advent. The word σταθῆναι, *to stand upright*, indicates the solemnity of the event. A divine power will be needed, if we are not to sink before the Son of man in His glory, and be forced to exclaim : "Mountains, fall on us !"

With this discourse before it, the embarrassment of rationalism is great. How explain the announcement of the destruction of Jerusalem, if there are no prophecies? that of the Parousia, if Jesus is but a sinful man like ourselves (not to say, with Rénan, a fanatic)? Baur and Strauss say : Under the influence of Daniel's extravagant sayings, Jesus could easily predict His return ; but He could not announce the destruction of Jerusalem. Hase and Schenkel say : Jesus, as a good politician, might well foresee and predict the destruction of the temple, but (and this is also M. Colani's opinion) it is impossible to make a fanatic of Him announcing His return. Each writer thus determines *à priori* the result of his criticism, according to his own dogmatic conviction. It is perfectly useless to discuss the matter on such bases. Keim recognizes the indisputable historical reality of the announcement of the destruction of Jerusalem, on the ground of Matt. 26 : 60 (the false witnesses), and of Acts 6 : 11–14 (Stephen), and the truth of the promise of the Parousia as well, the saying Mark 13 . 32 is a proof of it which cannot be evaded. Nevertheless, agreeing in part with M. Colani, he regards the discourse Matt. 24 as the composition of an author much later than the ministry of Jesus, who has improved upon some actual words of His. This apocalyptic poem, Jewish according to Weizsäcker, Judeo-Christian according to Colani and Keim, was written shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem.

The following are our objections to this hypothesis : 1. It is not in this discourse only that Jesus announces the catastrophe of Israel, and appends the extraordinary assertion of His return. On the destruction of Jerusalem, read again Matt. 21 : 44, Luke 19 : 42–44, Mark 11 : 14, 20, 12 : 9, etc. etc. ; and on the Parousia, Matt. 7 : 21–23, 19 : 28, 25 : 31–46, 26 : 63, 64, Luke 9 : 26 and parall., 13 : 23–27, etc. How could those numerous declarations which we find scattered over different parts of our Syn. Gospels, be all borrowed from this alleged apocalyptic poem? 2. How could a private composition have obtained such general authority, under the very eyes of the apostles or their first disciples, that it found admission into our three Syn. Gospels as an authentic saying of our Lord? Was ever a pure poem transformed into an exact and solemn discourse, such as that expressly put by our three evangelists at this determinate historical time into the mouth of Jesus? Such a hypothesis is nothing else than a stroke of desperation.

Volkmar finds in this discourse, as everywhere, the result of the miserable intrigues of the Christian parties. John the apostle had published in 68 the great reverie of the Apocalypse. He still hoped for the preservation of the temple (Rev. 11 : 1 *et seq.*), which proves that he had never heard his Master announce its destruction. Five years later, in 73, Mark composes another Apocalypse, intended to rectify the former. He elaborates it from the Pauline standpoint ; he rejects its too precise dates, and the details which had been hazarded, but which the event had proved false ; the fixing, *e.g.*, of the three years and a half which were to extend to the Parousia, a date for which he prudently substitutes the saying : "As to that day, even I myself know it not," etc. Such is the origin of the great eschatological discourse in the Syn., the most ancient monument of which is Mark 13. But, 1. This alleged dogmatic contrast between the discourse Mark 13 and the Apocalypse exists only in the mind of Volkmar ; the latter celebrates the conversion of the Gentiles with the same enthusiasm as the former foretells it. 2. The composition of the Apocalypse in 68 is

an hypothesis, the falsehood of which we have, as we think, demonstrated.* 3. It is utterly false that the Apocalypse teaches the preservation of the temple of Jerusalem. The description 11 : 1 *et seq.*, if it is to be rescued from absurdity, must necessarily be taken in a figurative sense, as we have also demonstrated.† 4. Certainly the poetical representations of the Apocalypse were not the original of the simple, concise, prosaic expressions of the discourse of Jesus in the Syn. ; it was these, on the contrary, which served as a canvas for the rich delineations of the Apocalypse. Is it not evident that the literal terms *war*, *famine*, *pestilence*, *earthquakes*, in the mouth of Jesus (Luke 21 : 9–11 and parall.), are amplified and developed into the form of complete visions in the apocalyptic seals (*war*, in Rev. 6 : 3, 4 ; *famine*, in vers. 5 : 6 ; *pestilence*, in vers. 7, 8 ; *earthquake*, in vers. 12–17 ; comp. also the *persecutions* foretold Luke 5 : 16, 17, with Rev. 6 : 9–11, and the false Christs and prophets predicted Matt. 24 : 24, with Rev. 13)? The inverse procedure, the return from the elaborate to the simple, from the Apocalypse to the Gospels, is in its very nature inadmissible. The composition of Jesus' discourse in the Syn. is therefore anterior to that of the Apocalypse, and not the reverse. 5. The historical declaration of Jesus in Mark : "Of that day knoweth no man, not even the Son," is confirmed by Matt. 24 : 36 and Mark 12 : 35. It results from the very contents of this marvellous saying. Who would have thought, at the time, when the conviction of the Lord's divinity was making way with so much force in the Church, and when Jesus was represented in this very discourse as the universal Judge, of putting into His mouth a saying which seemed to bring Him down to the level of other human beings? Such a saying must have rested on the most authentic tradition. 6. We have proved the mutual independence of the three synoptical accounts. The origin of this discourse of Jesus was therefore, no doubt, apostolical tradition circulating in the Church, agreeably to Luke 1 : 1, 2.

Jesus then called Himself, and consequently either knew or believed Himself to be, the future judge of the Church and the world. In the former case, He must be something more than a sinful man—He can be only the God-man ; in the latter, He is only a fool carried away with pride. In vain will MM. Colani, Volkmar, and Keim attempt to escape from this dilemma. Genuine historical criticism and an impartial exegesis will always raise it anew, and allow no other choice than between the Christ of the Church and the clever charmer of M. Rénan.

What conclusion should be drawn from this discourse as to the date when our Syn., and Luke in particular, were composed? De Wette has justly concluded, from the close connection which this discourse, as we have it in Matthew, fixes between the destruction of Jerusalem and the Parousia, that this Gospel must have been composed before the former of those two events. And, in truth, it requires all Volkmar's audacity to attempt to prove the contrary by means of that very εὐθέως, *immediately* (24 : 29), which so directly, as we have seen, connects the second event with the first. But if this conclusion is well founded in regard to the first Gospel, it is not less applicable to the second, which in this respect is in exactly the same circumstances as the first. As to Luke, it has often been inferred from the well-marked distinction kept up between the two subjects and the two discourses (Parousia, chap. 17 ; destruction of Jerusalem chap. 21), that he wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem, when the interval between the two events was historically established. Rational as this conclusion may appear at first sight, it is nevertheless unfounded. For, 1. Luke himself, as we have seen at ver. 32, is not wholly exempt from the confusion which prevails in the other two. 2. If Jesus in His own judgment distinctly separated those two events, why might He not have spoken of them Himself in two separate discourses ; and why might not Luke, in this case as in many others, have simply reproduced the historical fact from more exact originals (1 : 3, 4)?

3. *General View of the Situation :* vers. 37, 38.‡—The preceding discourse was delivered by Jesus on the Tuesday or Wednesday evening. Luke here characterizes our Lord's mode of living during the last days of His life. Αὐλίζεσθαι : to pass the

* "Bulletin Théologique," 1865, pp. 236–249. † Ib. p. 242.

‡ Ver. 38. 4 Mnn. add at the end of this verse, και απηλθον εκαστος εις τον οικον αυτου, then the narrative John 8 · 1–11.

night in the open air. The use of the εἰς arises from the idea of motion contained in ἐξερχόμενος (Bleek). 4 Mnn. place here, after ver. 38, the account of the woman taken in adultery, which in a large number of documents is found John 7 : 53–8 : 11. We can only see in this piece, in Luke as well as in John, an interpolation doubtless owing to some marginal note taken by a copyist from the Gospel of the Hebrews, and which in some MSS. had found its way into the text of the Gospel. As to the rest, this narrative would stand much better in Luke than in John It has a close bond of connection with the contents of chap. 20 (the snares laid for Jesus). And an event of this kind may have actually occurred in the two or three days which are summarily described in vers. 37 and 38.

SIXTH PART.

THE PASSION.

CHAPS. 22 AND 23.

THE Saviour had taken up a truly royal attitude in the temple. Now this short anticipation of His kingdom, the normal blossoming of His prophetic activity, is over; and limiting Himself to a silence and passivity which have earned for this period the name of the Passion, He exercises that terrestrial priesthood which was to be the transition from His prophetic ministry to His celestial sovereignty.

We find in the fourth Gospel (chap. 12) a scene which must have occurred on one of the days referred to by Luke 21 : 37, 38, the discourse which Jesus uttered in the temple in answer to the question of some Greek proselytes who had desired to converse with Him, and the divine manifestation which took place on that occasion. Then it is said, "And He departed, and did hide Himself from them" (ver. 36). This departure could not be that of Matt. 24 : 1 (parall. Luke 21 : 5). The scene which precedes differs too widely. It took place, therefore, one or two days later; and this supposition agrees with the meaning of the last two verses of chap. 21, which forbid us to believe that after the eschatological discourse Jesus did not reappear in the temple. Thus, if we place the entry into Jerusalem on Sunday afternoon, the purification of the temple on Monday (Mark), the captious questions put to Him on Tuesday, and the prophecy respecting the destruction of Jerusalem on the evening of that day, the temple scene related John 12 may have occurred on Wednesday; in which case, Jesus would pass the last day, Thursday, in His retreat at Bethany with His disciples. If it is alleged, with Bleek, that the entry on Palm Day took place on Monday, each of the events mentioned is put back a day; and the temple scene falling in this case on Thursday, Jesus must, on the contrary, have passed this last day, like all the rest, at Jerusalem. Whatever Keim may say, who alleges two days of complete retirement, Wednesday and Thursday, everything considered, we regard the second supposition as the simplest.

The narrative of the Passion comprehends: I. The preparation for the Passion (22 : 1–46). II. The Passion (22 : 47; 23 : 46). III. The events following the Passion (23 : 47–56).

FIRST CYCLE.—CHAP. 22 : 1–46.

The Preparation for the Passion.

This cycle comprehends the three following events: Judas preparing for the Passion by selling Jesus; Jesus preparing His disciples for it at His last supper; Jesus preparing Himself for it by prayer in Gethsemane.

I. *The Treachery of Judas:* 22 : 1–6.*—Vers. 1–6. The resolution of the Sanhedrim was taken. The only question for it henceforth was that of the *how* (τὸ πῶς, ver. 2). Its perplexity arose from the extraordinary favor which Jesus enjoyed with the people, particularly with the crowds who had come from Galilee and from abroad; the rulers feared a popular rising on the part of those numerous friends who had come from a distance with Him, and of whom they did not feel themselves the masters, as they did of the population of Jerusalem. So, according to Matthew and Mark, they said in their conclaves, "Not during the feast," which may signify either *before*, ere the multitudes are fully assembled, or *after*, when they shall have departed, and they shall be again masters of the field. But it was in exact keeping with the divine plan that Jesus should die *during* the feast (ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ); and the perfidy of Judas, the means which the rulers thought they could use to attain their end, was that of which God made use to attain His.

It appears from Matt. 26 : 2 and Mark 14 : 1 that it was Wednesday when the negotiation between Judas and the Sanhedrim took place. Luke and Mark omit the words of Jesus (Matthew), "In two days is the Passover . . ." But those *two days* appear in Mark in the form of the narrative. The word *Passover*, τὸ πάσχα, from פסח, in Aramaic פסחא, signifies a *passing*, and commemorates the manner in which the Israelites were spared in Egypt when the Almighty *passed* over their houses, sprinkled with the blood of the lamb, without slaying their first-born. This name, which originally denoted the lamb, was applied later to the Supper itself, then to the entire feast. The Passover was celebrated in the first month, called *Nisan*, from the 15th of the month, the day of full moon, to the 21st. This season corresponds to the end of March and beginning of April. The feast opened on the evening which closed the 14th and began the 15th, with the Paschal Supper. Originally every father, in virtue of the priesthood belonging to every Israelite, sacrificed his lamb himself at his own house. But since the Passover celebrated by Josiah, the lambs were sacrificed in the temple, and with the help of the priests. This act took place on the afternoon of the 14th, from three to six o'clock. Some hours after the Supper began, which was prolonged far into the night. This Supper opened the feast of *unleavened bread* (ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων, ver. 1) which, according to the law, lasted the seven following days. The first and last (15th and 21st) were sabbatic. The intermediate days were not hallowed by acts of worship and sacrifices; work was lawful. As Josephus expressly says that the feast of unleavened bread lasted *eight* days, agreeing with our Syn., who make it begin on the 14th (ver. 7; Matt. 26 : 17; Mark 14 : 12), and not on the 15th, we must conclude that in practice the use of unleavened bread had been gradually extended to the 14th. To the present day, it is on the night between the 13th and 14th that all leaven is removed from Israelitish houses.

Luke, ver. 3, ascribes the conduct of Judas to a Satanic influence. He goes the length of saying that Satan *entered into him*. He means to remark here, in a general way, the intervention of that superior agent in this extraordinary crime; while John, seeking to characterize its various *degrees*, more exactly distinguishes the time when Satan put into the heart of Judas the first thought of it (comp. 13 : 2), and the

* Ver. 3. A. B. D. L. X., καλουμενον instead of επικαλουμενον. Ver. 4. C. P. 10 Mnn. Syr. Itplerique, add και τοις γραμματευσιν after τοις αρχιερευσιν. C. P. 9 Mnn Syrsch. add του ιερου after στρατηγοις. Ver. 5. The mss. are divided between αργυριον and αργυρια. Ver. 6. ℵ* C. Itplerique, omit και εξωμολογησεν.

moment when he *entered into him* so as to take entire possession of his will (13 : 27). According to the biblical view, this intervention of Satan did not at all exclude the liberty of Judas. This disciple, in joining the service of Jesus, had not taken care to deny his own life, as Jesus so often urged His own to do. Jesus, instead of becoming the end to his heart, had remained the means. And now, when he saw things terminating in a result entirely opposed to that with which he had ambitiously flattered himself, he wished at least to try to benefit by the false position into which he had put himself with his nation, and to use his advantages as a disciple in order to regain the favor of the rulers with whom he had broken. The thirty pieces of silver certainly played only a secondary part in his treachery, although this part was real notwithstanding ; for the epithet thief (John 12 : 6) is given to him with the view of putting his habitual conduct in connection with this final act. Matthew and Mark insert here the narrative of the feast at Bethany, though it must have taken place some days before (John). The reason for this insertion is an association of ideas arising from the moral relation between these two particulars in which the avarice of Judas showed itself. The στρατηγοί, *captains* (ver. 4), are the heads of the soldiery charged with keeping guard over the temple (Acts 4 : 1). There was a positive contract (*they covenanted, he promised*). Ἀτερ, not *at a distance* from the multitude, but *without* a multitude ; that is to say, without any flocking together produced by the occasion. This wholly unexpected offer determined the Sanhedrim to act *before* rather than *after* the feast. But in order to that, it was necessary to make haste ; the last moment had come.

II. *The Last Supper:* 22 : 7–38.—We find ourselves here face to face with a difficulty which, since the second century of the Church, has arrested the attentive readers of the Scriptures. As it was on the 14th Nisan, in the afternoon, that the Paschal lamb was sacrificed, that it might be eaten the evening of the same day, it has been customary to take the time designated by the words, ver. 7, *Then came the day of unleavened bread when the Passover must be killed* (comp. Matthew and Mark), as falling on the morning of that 14th day ; from which it would follow that the Supper, related ver. 14, *et seq.*, took place the evening between the 14th and 15th. This view seems to be confirmed by the parallels Matt. 26 : 17, Mark 14 : 12, where the disciples (not Jesus, as in Luke) take the initiative in the steps needed for the Supper If such was the fact, it appeared that the apostles could not have been occupied with the matter till the morning of the 14th. But thereby the explanation came into conflict with John, who seems to say in a considerable number of passages that Jesus was *crucified* on the afternoon of the 14th, at the time when they were slaying the lamb in the temple, which necessarily supposes that the last Supper of Jesus with His disciples took place the evening between the 13th and 14th, the eve before that on which Israel celebrated the Paschal Supper, and not the evening between the 14th and 15th. This seeming contradiction does not bear on the day of the *week* on which Jesus was crucified. According to our four Gospels, this day was indisputably Friday. The difference relates merely to the day of the *month*, but on that very account, also, to the relation between the last Supper of Jesus at which He instituted the Eucharist, and the Paschal feast of that year. Many commentators—Wieseler, Hofmann, Lichtenstein, Tholuck, Riggenbach—think that they can identify the meaning of John's passages with the idea which at first sight appears to be that of the synoptical narrative ; Jesus, according to John as according to the Syn., celebrated His last Supper on the evening of the 14th, and instituted the Holy Supper

while celebrating the Passover conjointly with the whole people. We have explained in our "Commentaire sur l'évangile de Jean" the reasons which appear to us to render this solution impossible.* The arguments advanced since then by the learned Catholic theologian Langen, and by the eminent philologist Bäumlein, have not changed our conviction.† The meaning which presents itself first to the mind on reading John's Gospel, is and remains the only possible one, exegetically speaking. But it may and should be asked in return, What is the true meaning of the synoptical narrative, and its relation to John's account thus understood? Such is the point which we procced to examine as we study more closely the text of Luke.

The narrative of Luke embraces: 1. The preparation for the feast (vers. 7–13); 2. The feast itself (vers. 14–23); 3. The conversations which followed the feast (vers. 24–38.)

1. *The Preparations:* vers. 7–13,‡—There is a marked difference between the ἦλθε, *came*, of ver. 7, and the ἤγγιζε, *drew nigh*, of ver. 1. The word *drew nigh* placed us one or two days before the Passover; the word *came* denotes the beginning of the day on which the lamb was killed, the 14th. Is this time, as is ordinarily supposed, the *morning* of the 14th? But after the Jewish mode of reckoning, the 14th began at even, about six o'clock. The whole night between the 13th and 14th, in our language, belonged to the 14th. How, then, could the word *came* apply to a time when the entire first half of the day was already past? The *came* of ver. 7 seems to us, therefore, to denote what in our language we should call the evening of the 13th (among the Jews the time of transition from the 13th to the 14th, from four to six o'clock). The expressions of Matthew and Mark, without being so precise, do not necessarily lead to a different meaning. Indeed, the expression of Mark, ver. 12, does not signify, "at the time when they killed . . ." but "the day when they . . ." But may we place on the 13th, in the evening, the command of Jesus to His two disciples to prepare the feast for the morrow? That is not only possible, but necessary. On the morning of the 14th it would have been too late to think of pro-

* See at 13 : 1, 18 . 28, 19 : 14, and the special dissertation, t. ii. pp. 629–636.

† Langen, "Die letzten Lebenstage Jesu," 1864; Bäumlein, "Commentar über das Evangelium Johannis," 1863. Both apply the expression *before the feast of Passover* (John, 13 : 1), to the evening of the 14th, making the feast of Passover, properly so called, begin on the morning of the 15th. Langen justifies this way of speaking by Deut. 16 : 6, where he translates: "At the *rising* of the sun (instead of at the *going down* of the sun) is the feast of the coming forth out of Egypt." This translation is contrary to the analogy of Gen. 28 : 11, etc. The passage of Josephus which he adds (Antiq. iii. 10. 5) has as little force. We think that we have demonstrated how insufficient is Deut. 16 : 2 to justify that interpretation of John 18 : 28 which would reduce the meaning of the phrase, *to eat the Passover*, to the idea of eating the unleavened bread and the sacrificial viands of the Paschal week. As to John 19 : 14, there is no doubt that, as Langen proves, the N. T. (Mark 15 : 42), the Talmud, and the Fathers use the term παρασκευή, *preparation*, to denote *Friday* as the weekly preparation for the Sabbath, and that, consequently, in certain contexts the expression παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, *preparation of the Passover*, might signify the Friday of the Passover week. But this meaning is excluded in John : 1*st*. By the ambiguity which the expression must have presented to the mind of his Greek readers; 2*d*. By the fact that no reader of the Gospel could be ignorant that the narrative lay in the Paschal week.

‡ Ver. 7. B. C. D. L. omit εν before η. Ver. 10. ℵ. B. C. L., εις ην instead of ου or ου εαν. Ver. 12. Instead of ανωγεον (T. R. with X. Γ.), 4 Mjj. ανωγαιον, the others αναγαιον. ℵ. L. X., κακει instead of εκει. Ver. 13. ℵ. B. C. D. L., ειρηκει instead of ειρηκεν.

curing an apartment for that very evening. Strauss fully acknowledges this : * "In consequence of the flocking of pilgrims from a distance, it was of course difficult, and even impossible to find on the morning of the first day of the feast (the 14th), for the very evening, a room not yet taken up." Places were then taken at least a day in advance. Clement of Alexandria, on this account, gives the 13th the name of *προετοιμασία, pro-preparation.* The 14th was *the preparation,* because on that day the lamb was killed ; the 13th, the *pro-preparation,* because, as Clement says, on that day they consecrated the unleavened bread and took all the other steps necessary for the Paschal feast.† Hence it follows, that the question put by Matthew and Mark into the mouth of the disciples, "Where wilt Thou that we prepare the Passover?" *must* likewise be placed on the evening of the 13th, which for the Jews was already passing into the 14th. It matters little, therefore, so far as this question is concerned, whether the initiative be ascribed to Jesus (Luke) or to the disciples (Matthew and Mark). As to the rest, on this point the narrative of Luke is evidently the most precise and exact, for he also, ver. 9, relates the question of the disciples, but replacing it in its true position. Luke alone mentions the names of the two apostles chosen. He must have borrowed this detail from a private source—at least if he did not invent it! In any case, the fact would not agree very well with his alleged habitual animosity against St. Peter.‡ Jesus must have had an object in specially choosing those two disciples. We shall see, in fact, that this was a confidential mission, which could be trusted to none but His surest and most intimate friends. If it was between four and six o'clock in the evening, the apostles had yet time to execute their commission before night, whether they had passed the day in the city, and Jesus left them to do it when He Himself was starting for Bethany with the purpose of returning later to Jerusalem, or whether He had passed the whole of this last day at Bethany, and sent them from the latter place.

Why does Jesus not describe to them more plainly (vers. 10–12) the host whom He has in view? There is but one answer : He wishes the house where He reckons on celebrating the feast to remain unknown to those who surround Him at the time when He gives this order. This is why, instead of describing it, He gives the sign indicated. Jesus knew the projects of Judas ; the whole narrative of the feast which follows proves this ; and He wished, by acting in this way, to escape from the hindrances which the treachery of His disciple might have put in His way in the use which He desired to make of this last evening. The sign indicated, a man drawing water from a fountain, is not so accidental as it appears. On the evening of the 13th, *before the stars appeared in the heavens,* every father, according to Jewish custom, had to repair to the fountain to draw pure water with which to knead the unleavened bread. It was, in fact, a rite which was carried through to the words : "This is the water of unleavened bread." Then a torch was lighted, and during some following part of the night the house was visited, and searched in every corner, to put away the smallest vestige of leaven. There is thus a closer relation than appears between the sign and its meaning. Here is a new proof of the supernatural knowledge of

* "Leben Jesu für d. d. Volk," p. 533.

† "On this day (the 13th) took place the consecration of the unleavened bread and the pro-preparation of the feast." (Fragment of his book, *περὶ τοῦ πάσχα*, preserved in the "Chronicon Paschale.")

‡ So small a thing does not trouble Baur! Here, according to him, we have a malicious notice from Luke, who wishes to indicate those two chiefs of the Twelve as the representatives of ancient Judaism (!).

Jesus. The fact is omitted in Matthew. As usual, this evangelist abridges the narrative of facts. Probably Jesus knew the master of the house mentioned ver. 11, and had already asked this service of him conditionally (ver. 12). Ἀνάγαιον (in the Attic form, ἀνώγεων), the upper room, which sometimes occupies a part of the terrace of the house. *All furnished:* provided with the necessary divans and tables (the *triclinium*, in the shape of a horseshoe).

Matthew (26 : 18) has preserved to us, in the message of Jesus to the master of the house, a saying which deserves to be weighed: "My time is at hand; let me keep the Passover at thy house with my disciples." How does the first of those two propositions form a ground for the request implied in the second? Commentators have seen in the first an appeal to the owner's sensibilities: I am about to die; grant me this last service Ewald somewhat differently: Soon I shall be in my glory, and I shall be able to requite thee for this service. These explanations are far-fetched. We can explain the thought of Jesus, if those words express the necessity under which He finds Himself laid, by the nearness of His death, *to anticipate* the celebration of the Passover: "My death is near, to-morrow it will be too late for me to keep the Passover; let me celebrate it at thy house [this evening] with my disciples." Ποιῶ is not the att. fut. (Bleek), but the present (Winer): "Let me keep it *immediately*." It was a call to the owner instantly to prepare the room, and everything which was necessary for the feast. The two disciples were to make those preparations in conjunction with the host. No doubt the lamb could not be slain in the temple; but could Jesus, being excommunicated with all His adherents, and already even laid under sentence of arrest by the Sanhedrim (John 11 : 53–57), have had His lamb slain on the morrow in the legal form? That is far from probable. Jesus is about to substitute the new Passover for the old. How should He not have the right to free Himself from the letter of the ordinance? all the more that, according to the original institution, every father was required himself to slay the Paschal lamb in his dwelling. He freed Himself in like manner from the law as to the *day*. He is forced, indeed, to do so, if He wishes Himself to substitute the new feast for the old. The decision of the Sanhedrim to put Him to death *before* the feast (Matt. 26 : 5), leaves Him no choice. This entire state of things agrees with the expression which John uses: *δείπνου γενομένου*, *a supper having* taken place (13 : 2).

2. *The Supper:* vers. 14–23.—There are three elements which form the material of this narrative in the three Syn.: 1*st*. The expression of the personal feelings of Jesus. With this Luke begins, and Matthew and Mark close. 2*d*. The institution of the Holy Supper. It forms the centre of the narrative in the three Syn. 3*d*. The disclosure of the betrayal, and the indication of the traitor. With this Luke ends, and Matthew and Mark begin. It is easy to see how deeply the facts themselves were impressed on the memory of the witnesses, but how secondary the interest was which tradition attached to chronological order. The myth, on the contrary, would have created the whole of a piece, and the result would be wholly different. Luke's order appears preferable. It is natural for Jesus to begin by giving utterance to His personal impressions, vers. 15–18. With the painful feeling of approaching separation there is connected, by an easily understood bond, the institution of the Holy Supper, that sign which is in a way to perpetuate Christ's visible presence in the midst of His own after His departure, vers. 19, 20. Finally, the view of the close communion contracted by this solemn act between the disciples causes the feeling of the contrast between them and Judas, so agonizing to Him, to break forth into expression. Such

is the connection of the third part. It is far from probable, as it seems to us, that Jesus *began* by speaking of this last subject (Matthew and Mark). John omits the first two elements. The first was not essential to his narrative. The second, the institution of the Holy Supper, was sufficiently well known from tradition. We have, in our "Commentaire sur l'évangile de Jean," placed this latter event at the time indicated by 13 : 2 in that Gospel (*δείπνου γενομένου*). The feet-washing which followed necessarily coincides with the indication of the traitor in Luke, and with the subsequent conversation, ver. 24 *et seq.* ; and the two accounts thus meet in the common point, the prediction of Peter's denial (Luke, ver. 31 ; John, ver. 38).

As in what follows there are repeated allusions to the rites of the Paschal Supper, we must rapidly trace the outlines of that Supper as it was celebrated in our Saviour's time. First step : After prayer, the father of the house sent round a cup full of wine (according to others, each one had his cup), with this invocation : "Blessed be Thou, O Lord our God, King of the world, who hast created the fruit of the vine!" Next there were passed from one to another the bitter herbs (a sort of salad), which recalled to mind the sufferings of the Egyptian bondage. These were eaten after being dipped in a reddish sweet sauce (*Charoseth*), made of almonds, nuts, figs, and other fruits ; commemorating, it is said, by its color the hard labor of brick-making imposed on the Israelites, and by its taste, the divine alleviations which Jehovah mingles with the miseries of His people. Second step : The father circulates a second cup, and then explains, probably in a more or less fixed liturgical form, the meaning of the feast, and of the rites by which it is distinguished. Third step : The father takes two unleavened loaves (cakes), breaks one of them, and places the pieces of it on the other. Then, uttering a thanksgiving, he takes one of the pieces, dips it in the sauce, and eats it, taking with it a piece of the Paschal Lamb, along with bitter herbs. Each one follows his example. This is the feast properly so called. The lamb forms the principal dish. The conversation is free. It closes with the distribution of a third cup, called the *cup of blessing*, because it was accompanied with the giving of thanks by the father of the house. Fourth step : The father distributes a fourth cup ; then the *Hallel* is sung (Ps. 113–118). Sometimes the father added a fifth cup, which was accompanied with the singing of the *great Hallel* (Ps. 120–127 ; according to others, 135–137 ; according to Delitzsch, Ps. 136).*

Must it be held, with Langen, that Jesus began by celebrating the entire Jewish ceremony, in order to *connect* with it thereafter the Christian Holy Supper ; or did He *transform*, as He went along, the Jewish supper in such a way as to convert it into the sacred Supper of the N. T. ? This second view seems to us the only tenable one. For, 1. It was *during* the course of the feast, *ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν* (Matthew and Mark), and not *after* the feast (as Luke says in speaking of the only cup), that the bread of the Holy Supper must have been distributed. 2. The singing of the hymn spoken of by Mark and Matthew can only be that of the Hallel, and it *followed* the institution of the Holy Supper.

1*st*. Vers. 14–18.† Jesus opens the feast by communicating to the disciples His

* This ritual is very variously described by those who have given attention to the subject. We have followed the account of Langen, p. 147 *et seq.*

† Ver. 14. ℵ* B. D. Vss. omit *δωδεκα*. Ver. 16. 6 Mjj. omit *ουκετι*. ℵ. B. C. L. 5 Mnn. Vss., *αυτο* instead of *εξ αυτου*. Ver. 17. 6 Mjj. 25 Mnn. add *το* before *ποτηριον* (taken from ver. 20). ℵ* B. C. L. M. 8 Mnn. Syr. It. Vg., *εις εαυτους* instead of *εαυτοις*. Ver. 18. 5 Mjj. 15 Mnn. omit *οτι*. 6 Mjj. 15 Mnn. add *απο του νυν* after *πια*. ℵ. B. F. L. 10 Mnn., *ου* instead of *οτου*.

present impressions. This first step corresponds to the first of the Paschal feast. *The hour* (ver. 14) is that which He had indicated to His disciples, and which probably coincided with the usual hour of the sacred feast. According to the law (Ex. 12 : 17), the Passover should have been eaten standing. But custom had introduced a change in this particular. Some Rabbins pretend to justify this deviation, by saying that to stand is the posture of a slave ; that, once restored to liberty by the going forth from Egypt, Israel was called to eat sitting. The explanation is ingenious, but devised after the fact. The real reason was, that the feast had gradually taken larger proportions. There is in the first saying of Jesus, which Luke alone has preserved (ver. 15), a mixture of profound joy and sorrow. Jesus is glad that He can celebrate this holy feast once more, which He has determined by His own instrumentality to transform into a permanent memorial of His person and work ; but on the other hand, it is His last Passover here below. Ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα, a frequent form in the LXX., corresponding to the Hebrew construction of the inf. absolute with the finite verb. It is a sort of reduplication of the verbal idea. Jesus, no doubt, alludes to all the measures which He has required to take to secure the joy of those quiet hours despite the treachery of His disciple. Could the expression *this Passover* possibly denote a feast at which the Paschal lamb was wanting, and which was only distinguished from ordinary suppers by unleavened bread? Such is the view of Caspari and Andreæ, and the view which I myself maintained ("Comment. sur Jean," t. ii. p. 634) Indeed the number of lambs or kids might turn out to be insufficient, and strangers find themselves in the dilemma either of celebrating the feast without a lamb, or not celebrating the Passover at all. Thus in "Mischnah Pesachim" 10 there is express mention of a Paschal Supper *without a lamb*, and at which the unleavened bread is alone indispensable. Nevertheless, there is nothing to prevent us from holding that, as we have said, the two disciples prepared the lamb in a strictly private manner. It would be difficult to explain Luke's expression, *to eat this Passover*, without the smallest reference to the lamb at this feast. By the future Passover in the kingdom of God (ver. 16) might be understood the Holy Supper as it is celebrated in the Church. But the expression, "*I* will not any more eat thereof until . . . " and the parall. ver. 18, do not admit of this spiritualistic interpretation. Jesus means to speak of a new banquet which shall take place after the consummation of all things. The Holy Supper is the bond of union between the Israelitish and typical Passover, which was reaching its goal, and the heavenly and divine feast, which was yet in the distant future. Does not the *spiritual* salvation, of which the Supper is the memorial, form in reality the transition from the *external* deliverance of Israel to that salvation at once *spiritual* and *external* which awaits the glorified Church?

After this simple and touching introduction, Jesus, in conformity with the received custom, passed the first cup (ver. 17), accompanying it with a thanksgiving, in which He no doubt paraphrased freely the invocation uttered at the opening of the feast by the father of the house, and which we have quoted above. Δεξάμενος, *receiving*, seems to indicate that He took the cup from the hands of one of the attendants who held it out to Him (after having filled it). The distribution (διαμερίσατε) may have taken place in two ways, either by each drinking from the common cup, or by their all emptying the wine of that cup into their own. The Greek term would suit better this second view. Did Jesus Himself drink? The pron. ἑαυτοῖς, *among yourselves*, might seem unfavorable to this idea ; yet the words, *I will not drink until* . .

speak in favor of the affirmative. Was it not, besides, a sign of communion from which Jesus could hardly think of refraining on such an occasion? The expression *fruit of the vine*, ver. 18, was an echo of the terms of the ritual Paschal prayer. In the mouth of Jesus, it expressed the feeling of contrast between the present terrestrial system, and the glorified creation which was to spring from the *palingenesia* (Matt. 19 : 28 ; comp. Rom. 8 : 31 *et seq.*). The phrase, *I will not drink*, corresponds to the *I will not any more eat* of ver. 16. But there is a gradation. Ver. 16 means, This is my last Passover, the last year of my life ; ver. 18, This is my last Supper, my last day. These words are the text from which Paul has taken the commentary, *till He come* (1 Cor. 11 : 26). They are probably also the ground into which was wrought the famous tradition of Papias regarding the fabulous vines of the millennial reign In this example, the difference becomes palpable between the sobriety of the tradition preserved in our Gospels, and the legendary exuberance of that of the times which followed. Ver. 29 of Matthew and 25 of Mark reproduce Luke's saying in a somewhat different form, and one which lends itself still better to the amplification which we find in Papias.

2d. Vers. 19, 20.* The time when the Holy Supper was instituted seems to us to correspond to the second and third steps of the Paschal feast taken together. With the explanation which the head of the house gave of the meaning of the ceremony, Jesus connected that which He had to give regarding the substitution of His person for the Paschal lamb as the means of salvation, and regarding the difference between the two deliverances. And when the time came at which the father took the unleavened cakes and consecrated them by thanksgiving to make them, along with the lamb, the memorial of the deliverance from Egypt, Jesus also took the bread, and by a similar consecration, made it the memorial of that salvation which He was about to procure for us. In the expression, *This is my body*, the supposed relation between the body and the bread should not be sought in their *substance*. The appendix : *given for you*, in Luke ; *broken for you*, in Paul (1 Cor. 11 : 24), indicates the true point of correspondence. No doubt, in Paul, this participle might be a gloss. But an interpolation would have been taken from Luke ; they would not have invented this *Hapax-legomenon* κλώμενον. Are we not accustomed to the arbitrary or purely negligent omissions of the Alex. text? I think, therefore, that this participle of Paul, as well as the *given* of Luke, are in the Greek text the necessary paraphrase of the literal Aramaic form. *This is my body for you*, a form which the Greek ear could as little bear as ours. The idea of this κλώμενον is, in any case, taken from the preceding ἔκλασε, and determines the meaning of the formula, *This is my body*. As to the word *is*, which has been so much insisted on, it was not uttered by Jesus, who must have said in Aramaic, *Haggouschmi*, "This here [behold] my body!" The exact meaning of the notion of *being*, which logically connects this subject with this attribute, can only be determined by the context. Is the point in question an identity of substance, physical or spiritual, or a relation purely symbolical? From the exegetical point of view, if what we have said above about the real point of comparison is well founded, it would be difficult to avoid the latter conclusion. It is confirmed by the meaning of the τοῦτο which follows : "Do *this* in remembrance of me." This pron. can denote nothing but *the act* of breaking, and thus precisely the point which appeared to us the natural link of connection between the bread and the body. The last words, which

* Ver. 20. ℵ. B. L. place και το ποτηριον before ωσαυτως.

contain the institution properly so called of a permanent rite, are wanting in Matthew and Mark. But the certified fact of the regular celebration of the Holy Supper as a feast commemorating the death of Jesus from the most primitive times of the Church, supposes a command of Jesus to this effect, and fully confirms the formula of Paul and Luke. Jesus meant to preserve the Passover, but by renewing its meaning. Matthew and Mark preserved of the words of institution only that which referred to the new *meaning* given to the ceremony. As to the *command* of Jesus, it had not been preserved in the liturgical formula, because it was implied in the very act of celebrating the rite.

A certain interval must have separated the second act of the institution from the first; for Luke says: *After they had supped* (ver. 20), exactly as Paul. Jesus, according to custom, let conversation take free course for some time. After this free interval, He resumed the solemn attitude which He had taken in breaking the bread. So we explain the ὡσαύτως, *likewise*. The word τὸ ποτήριον, *the cup*, is the object of the two verbs λαβών . . . ἔδωκεν at the beginning of ver. 19. The art. τό is here added, because the cup is already known (ver. 17). This cup certainly corresponded to the third of the Paschal Feast, which bore the name of *cup of blessing*. So St. Paul calls it (1 Cor. 10 : 16): *the cup of blessing* (εὐλογίας), *which we bless*. In this expression of the apostle the word *bless* is repeated, because it is taken in two different senses. In the first instance, it refers to God, whom the Church, like the Israelitish family of old, blesses and adores; in the second, to the cup which the Church consecrates, and which by this religious act becomes to the conscience of believers the memorial of the blood of Jesus Christ. What this cup represents, according to the terms of Paul and Luke, is the new *covenant* between God and man, founded on the shedding of Jesus' blood. In Matthew and Mark, it is the *blood* itself. Jesus can hardly have placed the two forms in juxtaposition, as Langen supposes, who thinks that He said: "Drink ye all of this cup; for it is the cup which contains my blood, the blood of the new covenant." Such a periphrasis is incompatible with the style proper to the institution of a rite, which has always something concise and monumental. There is thus room to choose between the form of Matthew and Mark and that of Paul and Luke. Now, is it not probable that oral tradition and ecclesiastical custom would tend to make the second formula, relative to the wine, uniform with the first, which refers to the bread, rather than to diversify them? Hence it follows that the greatest historical probability is in favor of the form in which the two sayings of Jesus least resemble one another, that is to say, in favor of that of Paul and Luke.

Every covenant among the ancients was sealed by some symbolic act. The new covenant, which on God's side rests on the free gift of salvation, and on man's side on its acceptance by faith, has henceforth, as its permanent symbol in the Church, this cup which Jesus holds out to His own, and which each of them freely takes and brings to his lips. The O. T. had also been founded on blood (Gen. 15 : 8 *et seq.*). It had been renewed in Egypt by the same means (Ex. 12 : 22, 23, 24 : 8). The participle understood between διαθήκη and ἐν τῷ αἵματι is the verbal idea taken from the subst. διαθήκη (διατιθεμένη): *the covenant* [covenanted] *in my blood*. Baur, Volkmar, and Keim think that it is Paul who has here introduced the idea of the *new covenant*. For it would never have entered into the thought of Judeo-Christianity thus to repudiate the old covenant, and proclaim a new one. Mark, even while copying Paul, designedly weakened this expression, they say, by rejecting the too offensive epithet *new*. Luke, a bolder Paulinist, restored it, thus reproducing Paul's complete for-

mula. And how, we must ask, did Jesus express Himself? Was He incapable, He also, of rising to the idea of a *new covenant* thenceforth substituted for the old? He incapable of doing what had already been done so grandly six centuries before by a simple prophet (Jer. 31 : 31 *et seq.*)! And when we think of it, is not Mark's formula (which is probably also the text in Matthew), far from being weaker than that of Paul—is it not even more forcible? If the expression of Mark is translated: "This is my blood, that of the covenant," is not the very name covenant thereby refused to the old? And if it is translated: "This is the blood of my covenant," does not this saying contrast the two covenants with one another as profoundly as is done by the epithet *new* in Paul and Luke?

The non. abs. τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον, by rendering the idea of the shedding of the blood grammatically independent, serves to bring it more strongly into relief. This appendix, which is wanting in Paul, connects Luke's formula with that of the other two evangelists. Instead of *for you*, the latter say, *for many*. It is the רבים, *many*, of Isa. 53 : 12, the גוים רבים of Isa. 52 : 15, *those many nations* which are to be sprinkled with the blood of the slain Messiah. Jesus contemplates them in spirit, those myriads of Jewish and Gentile believers who in future ages shall press to the banquet which He is instituting. Paul here repeats the command: *Do this* . . . on which rests the permanent celebration of the rite. In this point, too, Luke's formula corresponds more nearly to that of the Syn. than to his.

If there is a passage in respect to which it is morally impossible to assert that the narrators—if they be regarded ever so little as seriously believing—arbitrarily modified the tenor of the sayings of Jesus, it is this. How, then, are we to account for the differences which exist between the four forms? There must have existed from the beginning, in the Judeo-Christian churches, a generally received liturgical formula for the celebration of the Holy Supper. This is certainly what has been preserved to us by Matthew and Mark. Only, the differences which exist between them prove that they have not used a written document, and that as little has the one copied the other; thus the command of Jesus: "Drink ye all of it" (Matthew), which appears in Mark in the form of a positive fact: "And they all drank of it;" thus, again, in Mark, the omission of the appendix: "for the remission of sins" (Matthew). We therefore find in them what is substantially one and the same tradition, but slightly modified by oral transmission. The very different form of Paul and Luke obliges us to seek another original. This source is indicated by Paul himself: "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you" (1 Cor. 11 : 23). The expression, *I have received*, admits of no view but that of a communication which is personal to him; and the words, *of the Lord*, only of an immediate revelation from Jesus Himself (a true philologist will not object to the use of ἀπό instead of παρά). If Paul had had no other authority to allege than oral tradition emanating from the apostles, and known universally in the Church, the form used by him: "I have received (ἐγὼ γάρ) of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you . . ." could not be exonerated from the charge of deception. This circumstance, as well as the difference between the two formulæ, decides in favor of the form of Paul and Luke. In the slight differences which exist between them, we can, besides, trace the influence exercised on Luke by the traditional-liturgical form as it has been preserved to us by Matthew and Mark. As to St. John, the deliberate omission which is imputed to him would have been useless at the time when he wrote; still more in the second century, for the ceremony of the Holy Supper was then celebrated in all the churches of the world. A forger would have taken care not to overthrow the authority of his narrative in the minds of his readers by such an omission.

About the meaning of the Holy Supper, we shall say only a few words. This ceremony seems to us to represent the totality of salvation; the bread, the communication of the life of Christ; the wine, the gift of pardon; in other words, according to Paul's language, sanctification and justification. In instituting the rite, Jesus natu-

rally began with the bread ; for the shedding of the blood supposes the breaking of the vessel which contains it, the body. But as in the believer's obtaining of salvation it is by justification that we come into possession of the life of Christ, St. Paul, 1 Cor. 10 : 16 *et seq.*, follows the opposite order, and begins with the cup, which represents the first grace which faith lays hold of, that of pardon. In the act itself there are represented the two aspects of the work—the divine offer, and human acceptance. The side of human acceptance is clear to the consciousness of the partaker. His business is simply, as Paul says, " to show the Lord's death," 1 Cor. 11 : 26. It is not so with the divine side ; it is unfathomable and mysterious : " The communion of the blood, and of the body of Christ !" 1 Cor. 10 : 16. Here, therefore, we are called to apply the saying : " The secret things belong unto the Lord our God, but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law," Deut. 29 : 29. We know already what we have to do to celebrate a true communion. We may leave to God the secret of what He gives us in a right communion. Is it necessary to go farther in search of the formula of union ?

3d. Vers. 21–23.* " Only, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table. 22. And truly the Son of man goeth as it was determined : But woe unto that man by whom He is betrayed ! 23. And they began to inquire among themselves which of them it was that should do this thing." As He follows the cup circulating among the disciples, the attention of Jesus is fixed on Judas. In the midst of those hearts, henceforth united by so close a bond, there is one who remains outside of the common salvation, and rushes upon destruction. This contrast wounds the heart of Jesus. Πλήν, *excepting*, announces precisely the exception Judas forms in this circle ; ἰδού, *behold*, points to the surprise which so unexpected a disclosure must produce in the disciples. If this form used by Luke is historically trustworthy, there can be no doubt that Judas took part in celebrating the Holy Supper. No doubt the narratives of Matthew and Mark do not favor this view ; but they do not expressly contradict it, and we have already shown that the order in which Luke gives the three facts composing the narrative of the feast, is much more natural than theirs. Besides, John's order confirms that of Luke, if, as we think we have demonstrated (" Comment sur Jean," t. ii. p. 540 *et seq.*), the Holy Supper was instituted at the time indicated in 13 : 1, 2. Moreover, John's narrative shows that Jesus returned again and again during the feast to the treachery of Judas. As usual, tradition had combined those sayings uttered on the same subject at different points of time, and it is in this summary form that they have passed into our Syn. The expression of Matthew : " dipping the hand into the dish with me," signifies in a general way (like that of Luke : " being with me on the table," and the parallels) : " being my guest." Jesus does not distress Himself about what is in store for Him ; He is not the sport of this traitor ; everything, so far as He is concerned, is divinely decreed (ver. 22). His life is not in the hands of a Judas. The Messiah *ought* to die. But He grieves over the crime and lot of him who uses his liberty to betray Him.

The reading ὅτι is less simple than καί, and is hardly compatible with the μέν. The πλήν, *only* (ver. 21) is contrasted with the idea of the divine decree in ὡρισμένον. It serves the end of reserving the liberty and responsibility of Judas. The fact that every disciple, on hearing this saying, turned his thoughts upon himself, proves the consummate ability with which Judas had succeeded in concealing his feelings and plans. The μήτι ἐγώ, *Is it I?* of the disciples in Matthew and Mark, finds its natural

* Ver. 22. The MSS. are divided between καὶ (T. R., Byz.) and ὅτι (Alex.).

place here. It has been thought improbable that Judas also put the question (Matt. 5 : 25).* But when all the others were doing it, could he have avoided it without betraying himself? The *thou hast said* of Jesus denotes absolutely the same fact as John 13 : 26 ; "And when He had dipped the sop, He gave it to Judas Iscariot." This act itself was the reply which Matthew translates into the words : *Thou hast said.*

3. *The Conversations After the Supper :* vers. 24–38.—The conversations which follow refer : 1*st* To a dispute which arises at this moment between the apostles (vers. 24–30) 2*d*. To the danger which awaits them at the close of this hour of peace (vers. 31–38). The washing of the feet in John corresponds to the first piece. The prediction of St. Peter's denial follows in his Gospel, as it does in Luke. According to Matthew and Mark, it was uttered a little later, after the singing of the hymn. It is quite evident that Luke is not dependent on the other Syn., but that he has sources of his own, the trustworthiness of which appears on comparison with John's narrative.

1*st*. Vers. 24–30.† The cause of the dispute, mentioned by Luke only, cannot have been the question of precedence, as Langen thinks. The strife would have broken out sooner. The mention of the kingdom of God, vers. 16 and 18, might have given rise to it ; but the καί, *also*, of Luke, suggests another view. By this word he connects the question : *Which is the greatest?* with that which the disciples had just been putting to themselves, ver. 23 : *Which among us is he who shall betray Him?* The question which was the worst among them led easily to the other, which was the best of all. The one was the counterpart of the other. Whatever else may be true, we see by this new example that Luke does not allow himself to mention a situation at his own hand of which he finds no indication in his documents. The δοκεῖ, *appears* [should be accounted], refers to the judgment of men, till the time when God will settle the question. Comp. a similar dispute, 9 : 46 *et seq.* and parall. We are amazed at a disposition so opposed to humility at such a time. But Jesus is no more irritated than He is discouraged. It is enough for Him to know that He has succeeded in planting in the heart of the apostles a pure principle which will finally carry the day over all forms of sin : "Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you," He says to them Himself, John 15 : 3. He therefore calmly continues the work which He has begun. In human society, men reign by physical or intellectual force ; and εὐεργέτης, *benefactor*, is the flattering title by which men do not blush to honor the harshest tyrants. In the new society which Jesus is instituting, he who has most is not to make his superiority felt in any other way than by the superabundance of his services toward the weakest and the most destitute. The example of Jesus in this respect is to remain as the rule. The term ὁ νεώτερος, *the younger* (ver. 26), is parallel to ὁ διακονῶν, *he that doth serve*, because among the Jews the humblest and hardest labor was committed to the youngest members of the society (Acts 5 : 6, 10). If the saying of ver. 27 is not referred to the act of the feet-washing related John 13, we must apply the words : *I am among you as He that serveth*, to the life of Jesus in general, or perhaps to the sacrifice which He is now making of Himself (vers. 19 and 20). But in this way there is no accounting for the antithesis between : "he that *sitteth* at meat," and : "he that *serveth*." These expressions leave no doubt that the fact of the feet-washing was the occasion of this saying. Luke did not know it ; and

* Our author doubtless intended Matt. 26 : 25.—J. H.

† Ver. 26. ℵ. B. D. L. T., γινεσθω instead of γενεσθω. Ver. 30. 8 Mjj. (Byz.) 80 Mnn. omit εν τη βασιλεια μου. ℵ* D. X. 20 Mnn. Syr^{cur}. It^{aliq}. add δωδεκα before θρονων (taken from Matthew). 10 Mjj., καθησεσθε or καθησαθε instead of καθισεσθε.

he has confined himself to transmitting the discourse of Jesus as it was furnished to him by his document.

After having thus contrasted the ideal of an altogether new greatness with the so different tendency of the natural heart, Jesus proceeds to satisfy what of truth there was in the aspiration of the disciples (vers. 28–30). The *ὑμεῖς δέ, but ye*, alludes to Judas, who *had* not *persevered*, and who, by his defection, deprived himself of the magnificent privilege promised vers. 29 and 30. Perhaps the traitor had not yet gone out, and Jesus wished hereby to tell upon his heart. The *πειρασμοί, temptations*, of which Jesus speaks, are summed up in His rejection by His fellow-citizens. It was no small thing, on the part of the Eleven, to have persevered in their attachment to Jesus, despite the hatred and contempt of which he was the object, and the curses heaped upon Him by those rulers whom they were accustomed to respect. There is something like a feeling of gratitude expressed in the saying of Jesus. Hence the fulness with which He displays the riches of the promised reward. Ver. 29 refers to the approaching dispensation on the earth: ver. 30, to the heavenly future in which it shall issue. *Ἐγώ, I* (ver. 29), is in opposition to *ὑμεῖς, ye:* "That is what *ye* have done for me; this is what *I* do in my turn (*καί*) for you." The verb *διατίθεναι, to dispose*, is applied to testamentary dispositions. Bleek takes the object of this verb to be the phrase which follows, *that ye may eat . . .* (ver. 30); but there is too close a correspondence between *appoint* and *hath appointed unto me*, to admit of those two verbs having any but the same object, *βασιλείαν, the kingdom:* "I appoint unto you the kingdom, as my Father hath appointed it unto me." This *kingdom* is here the power exercised by man on man by means of divine life and divine truth. The truth and life which Jesus possessed shall come to dwell in them, and thereby they shall reign over all, as He Himself has reigned over them. Are not Peter, John, and Paul, at the present day, the rulers of the world? In substance, it is only another form of the thought expressed in John 13 : 20: "Verily I say unto you, He that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth Him that sent me." Is this an example of the way in which certain sayings of Jesus are transformed and spiritualized, as it were, in the memory of John, without being altered from their original sense? At least the obscure connection of this saying in John with what precedes is fully explained by Luke's context.

Ver. 30 might apply solely to the part played by the apostles in the government of the primitive Church, and in the moral judgment of Israel then exercised by them. But the expression, *to eat and drink at my table*, passes beyond this meaning. For we cannot apply this expression to the Holy Supper, which was no special privilege of the apostles. The phrase, *in my kingdom*, should therefore be taken in the same sense as in vers. 16 and 18. With the table where He is now presiding Jesus contrasts the royal banquet, the emblem of complete joy in the perfected kingdom of God. He likewise contrasts, in the words following, with the judgments which He and His shall soon undergo on the part of Israel, that which Israel shall one day undergo on the part of the Twelve. According to 1 Cor. 6 : 1 *et seq.* the Church shall judge the world, men and angels. In this judgment of the world by the representatives of Jesus Christ, the part allotted to the Twelve shall be Israel. Judgment here includes government, as so often in the O. T. *Thrones* are the emblem of power, as the table is of joy. If the traitor was yet present, must not such a promise made to his colleagues have been like the stroke of a dagger to his ambitious heart! Here, as we think, should be placed the final scene which led to his departure (John 13 : 21–27).

It seems to us that the Twelve are not very disadvantageously treated in this discourse of Jesus reported by Luke! * A saying entirely similar is found in Matt. 19 : 28, in a different context. That of Luke is its own justification.

2*d*. Vers. 31–38. Jesus announces to His disciples, first the moral danger which threatens them (vers. 31–34); then the end of the time of temporal well-being and security which they had enjoyed under His protection (vers. 35–38).

Vers. 31–34.† "And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat. 32 But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren. 33, 34." The warning ver. 31 might be connected with ver. 28: "Ye are they which have continued with me." There would be a contrast: "Here is a temptation in which ye shall not continue." But the mention of Satan's part, in respect of the disciples, seems to be suggested by the abrupt departure of Judas, in which Satan had played a decisive part (John 13 : 27: "And after the sop, Satan entered into him"). The tempter is present; he has gained the mastery of Judas; he threatens the other disciples also; he is preparing to attack Jesus Himself. "The prince of this world cometh," says Jesus in John (14 : 30). And the danger to each is in proportion to the greater or less amount of alloy which his heart contains. This is the reason why Jesus more directly addresses Peter. By the address: *Simon*, twice repeated, He alludes to his natural character, and puts him on his guard against that presumption which is its dominant characteristic. The ἐξ in ἐξητήσατο includes the notion: of getting him drawn out of the hands of God into his own. Wheat is purified by means of the sieve or fan; σινιάζω may apply to either. Satan asks the right of putting the Twelve to the proof; and he takes upon himself, over against God, as formerly in relation to Job, to prove that at bottom the best among the disciples is but a Judas. Jesus by no means says (ver. 32) that his prayer has been refused. Rather it appears from the intercession of Jesus that it has been granted. Jesus only seeks to parry the consequences of the fall which threatens them all, and which shall be especially perilous to Peter. Comp. Matthew and Mark: "All ye shall be offended because of me this night." The faithlessness of which they are about to be guilty, might have absolutely broken the bond formed between them and Him. That of Peter, in particular, might have cast him into the same despair which ruined Judas. But while the enemy was spying out the weak side of the disciples to destroy them, Jesus was watching and praying to parry the blow, or at least to prevent it from being mortal to any of them. Langen explains ἐπιστρέψις in the sense of שׁוּב: "strengthen thy brethren *anew*." But this meaning of ἐπιστρέφειν is unknown in Greek, and the πότε distinguishes the notion of the participle precisely from that of the principal verb.‡ This saying of Jesus is one of those which lift the curtain

* The author means by this that the idea of Luke having written his Gospel with the view of belittling the Twelve—which he combats, of course, throughout—is absurd in the light of this record.—J. H.

† Ver. 31. B. L. T. omit the words ειπε δε ο κυριος. Ver. 32. The mss. are divided between εκλειπη and εκλιπη, and between στηριξον and στηρισον. Ver. 34. Instead of πριν η, ℵ. B. L. T. 4 Mnn. read εως, K. M. X. Π. 15 Mnn. εως ου, D. εως οτου. ℵ. B. L. T. some Mnn., με απαρνηση ειδεναι instead of απαρνηση μη ειδεναι με.

‡ What the "converted" and the "strengthening"—not clearly intimated here—are, we may infer from the facts. Peter does not experience a "second conversion" in any true sense of the phrase. He had turned away from his Lord for a time. He is turned back again by the Lord's grace and the use of fitting means. The experi

which covers the invisible world from our view. Although it has been preserved to us only by Luke, Holtzmann acknowledges its authenticity. He ascribes it to a special tradition. That does not prevent him, however, from deriving this whole account from the common source, the proto-Mark. But vers. 35–38 are also peculiar to Luke, and show clearly that his source was different.

Peter believes in his fidelity more than in the word of Jesus. Jesus then announces to him his approaching fall. The name *Peter* reminds him of the height to which Jesus had raised him. Three crowings of the cock were distinguished ; the first between midnight and one o'clock, the second about three, the third between five and six. The third watch (from midnight to three o'clock), embraced between the first two, was also called *ἀλεκτοροφωνία, cock-crow* (Mark 13 : 35). The saying of Jesus in Luke, Matthew, and John would therefore signify : "To-day, before the second watch from nine o'clock to midnight have passed, thou shalt have denied me thrice." But Mark says, certainly in a way at once more detailed and exact : "Before the cock have crowed twice, thou shalt have denied me thrice." That is to say : before the end of the third watch, before three o'clock in the morning. The mention of those two crowings, the first of which should have already been a warning to Peter, perhaps makes the gravity of his sin the more conspicuous. Matthew and Mark place the prediction of the denial on the way to Gethsemane. But John confirms the account of Luke, who places it in the supper room. We need not refute the opinion of Langen, who thinks that the denial was predicted twice.

Vers. 35–38.* "And He said unto them, When I sent you without purse and scrip and shoes, lacked ye anything? And they said, Nothing. 36. Then He said unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip. And he that hath no [sword], let him sell his garment, and buy one. 37. For I say unto you, that this that is written must yet be accomplished in me, and He was reckoned among the transgressors : for the things concerning me are coming to an end. . . . 38." Till then, the apostles, protected by the favor which Jesus enjoyed with the people, had led a comparatively easy life. But the last conflict between Him and the Jewish authorities was about to break out, and how could the apostles, during all the rest of their career, escape the hostile blows? This is the thought which occupies our Lord's mind : He gives it a concrete form in the following figures. In ver. 35 He recalls to mind their first mission (9 : 1, *et seq.*). We learn on this occasion the favorable issue which had been the result of that first proof of their faith. The historian had told us nothing of it, 9 : 6. The object of *μὴ ἐχων* is evidently *μαχαίραν* (not *πήραν* or *βαλαντίον*) : "Let him who hath not [a sword], *buy one.*" It heightens the previous warning. Not only can they no longer reckon on the kind hospitality which they enjoyed during the time of their Master's popularity, and not only must they prepare to be treated henceforth like ordinary travellers, paying their way, etc.; but they shall even meet with open hostility. Disciples of a man treated as a *male-*

ence he thus had of Satan's subtle malignity, and of human weakness, prepares him to utter and write words of warning and direction to his brethren, on a momentous theme, on which Christians think too little.—J. H.

* Ver. 35. Vers. 35–38 were omitted by Marcion. Ver. 36. Instead of *ειπεν ουν*, ℵ B. L. T. 4 Mnn. Syr. *ειπεν δε*, ℵ* D. *ο δε ειπεν*. Instead of *πωλησατω*, D. *πωλησαι*, 8 Mjj. (Byz.) 115 Mnn. *πωλησει*; and instead of *αγορασατω*, 9 Mjj. (Byz.), the most of the Mnn., *αγορασει*. Ver. 37. 9 Mjj. (Alex.) 10 Mnn. omit *ετι* after *οτι*. ℵ. B. D. L. Ω T., *το* instead of *τα* after *και γαρ*.

factor, they shall be themselves regarded as dangerous men ; they shall see themselves at war with their fellow-countrymen and the whole world. Comp. John 15 : 18–25, the piece of which this is, as it were, the summary and parallel. The sword is here, as in Matt. 10 : 34, the emblem of avowed hostility. It is clear that in the mind of Him who said : "I send you forth *as lambs* among wolves," this weapon represents the power of holiness in conflict with the sin of the world—that *sword of the Spirit* spoken of by Paul (Eph. 6 : 17). The καὶ γάρ, *and in truth*, at the end of the verse, announces a second fact analogous to the former (*and*), and which at the same time serves to explain it (*in truth*). The tragical end of the ministry of Jesus *is also approaching*, and consequently no features of the prophetic description can be slow in being realized. The disciples seem to take literally the recommendation of Jesus, and even to be proud of their prudence. The words, *It is enough*, have been understood in this sense : "Let us say no more ; let us now break up ; events will explain to you my mind, which you do not understand." But is it not more natural to give to ἱκανόν ἐστι this mournfully ironic sense : "Yes, for the use which you shall have to make of arms of this kind, those two swords are enough." Here we must place the last words of John 14 : "Rise ; let us go hence." The Syn. have preserved only a few hints of the last discourses of Jesus (John 14 : 17). These were treasures which could not be transmitted to the Church in the way of oral tradition, and which, assuming hearers already formed in the school of Jesus like the apostles, were not fitted to form the matter of popular evangelization.

III. *Gethsemane :* 22 : 39–46.—The Lamb of God must be distinguished from typical victims by His free acceptance of death as the punishment of sin ; and hence there required to be in His life a decisive moment when, in the fulness of His consciousness and liberty, He *should accept* the punishment which He was to undergo. At Gethsemane Jesus did not drink the cup ; He consented to drink it. This point of time corresponds to that in which, with the same fulness and liberty, He refused in the wilderness universal sovereignty. There He rejected dominion over us without God ; here He accepts death for God and for us. Each evangelist has some special detail which attests the independence of his sources. Matthew exhibits specially the gradation of the agony and the progress toward acceptance. Mark has preserved to us this saying of primary importance : "Abba ! Father ! all things are possible unto Thee." Luke describes more specially the extraordinary physical effects of this moral agony. His account is, besides, very much abridged. John omits the whole scene, but not without expressly indicating its place (18 : 1). In the remarkable piece, 12 : 23–28, this evangelist had already unveiled the essence of the struggle which was beginning in the heart of Jesus ; and the passage proves sufficiently, in spite of Keim's peremptory assertions, that there is no dogmatic intention in the omission of the agony of Gethsemane. When the facts are sufficiently known, John confines himself to communicating some saying of Jesus which enables us to understand their spirit. Thus it is that chap. 3 sheds light on the ordinance of Baptism, and chap. 6 on that of the Holy Supper.* Heb. 5 : 7–9 contains a very evident allusion to the ac-

* They may "shed light," but that they, when uttered, referred to these ordinances is not yet proved. Why say to Nicodemus, "Art thou a master," etc., if the Lord referred to a rite not yet instituted ? But if our Lord referred to such passages as Ezek. 36 : 25, 26, the ignorance of Nicodemus was inexcusable. Even so the whole of the conversation in John 6 relates to the miracle of the manna, the words of the Jews drawing out those of our Lord. What force could there be in his repeated

count of Gethsemane—a fact the more remarkable, as that epistle is one of those which, at the same time, most forcibly exhibit the divinity of Jesus.

Vers. 39–46.* The word *came out* (ver. 39) includes His leaving the room and the city. The name, *the Mount of Olives*, which is used here by our three Syn., may designate in a wide sense the slope and even the foot of the mount which begins immediately beyond the Cedron. This is the sense to which we are led by John's account, 18 : 1. The north-west angle of the inclosure, which is now pointed out as the garden of Gethsemane, is fifty paces from the bed of the torrent. Ver. 40. Jesus invites His disciples to prepare by prayer for the trial which threatens their fidelity, and of which He has already forewarned them (ver. 31). The use of the word εἰσελθεῖν, *enter into*, to signify *to yield to*, is easily understood, if we contrast this verb in thought with διελθεῖν, to *pass through*. In Matthew and Mark, Jesus has no sooner arrived than He announces to His disciples His intention to pray Himself. Then, withdrawing a little with Peter, James, and John, He tells them of the agony with which His soul is all at once seized, and leaves them, that He may pray alone. These successive moments are all united in Luke in the ἀπεσπάσθη, *He was withdrawn* (ver. 41). There is in this term, notwithstanding Bleek's opinion, the idea of some violence to which He is subject ; He is dragged far from the disciples by anguish (Acts. 21 : 1). The expression, to the distance *of about a stone's cast*, is peculiar to Luke. Instead of *kneeling down*, Matthew says, He fell *upon His face ;* Mark, *upon the ground*. The terms of Jesus' prayer, ver. 42, differ in the three narratives, and in such a way that it is impossible the evangelists could have so modified them at their own hand. But the figure of the *cup* is common to all three ; it was indelibly impressed on tradition. This cup which Jesus entreats God to cause to pass from before (παρά) His lips, is the symbol of that terrible punishment the dreadful and mournful picture of which is traced before Him at this moment by a skilful painter with extraordinary vividness. The painter is the same who in the wilderness, using a like illusion, passed before His view the magical scene of the glories belonging to the Messianic kingdom.

Mark's formula is distinguished by the invocation, " Abba ! Father ! all things are possible unto Thee," in which the translation ὁ πατήρ, *Father*, has been added by the evangelist for his Greek readers. It is a last appeal at once to the fatherly love and omnipotence of God. Jesus does not for a moment give up the work of human salvation ; He asks only if the cross is really the indispensable means of gaining this end. Cannot God in His unlimited power find another way of reconciliation ? Jesus thus required, even He, to obey without understanding, *to walk by faith*.

rejoinders if the reference was to an ordinance of which the hearers could know absolutely nothing—for it had not yet been appointed ? The assumption that these two chapters relate to the sacraments of the Christian Church has done no little evil. There is abundant reason for both communications in the known history and prophecy of the Old Testament.—J. H.

* Ver. 39. 6 Mjj. some Mnn. omit αυτου after μαθηται. Ver. 42. The MSS. are divided between παρενεγκειν (T. R., Byz.), πιρενεγκαι (Alex.), and παρηνεγκι (B. D. T. 25 Mnn.). Vers. 43, 44. These two verses, which T. R. reads, with ℵ* etc. D F. G. H. K. L. M Q. U. X Λ. the most of the Mun. Syr. It. Just. Ir. Dion. al. Ar. Chrys. Eus., are wanting in ℵᵃ A. B. R. T. 3 Mnn. Sah. Cyr., in several Greek and Latin MSS. quoted by Hilary, Epiph., Jer. They are marked with signs of doubt in E. S. V. Δ. Π. 5 Mnn. ℵ. X. some Mnn. Vss., καταβαινοντος instead of καταβαινοντες. Ver. 45. All the Mjj. omit αυτου after μαθητας.

Hence the expressions, Heb. 5 : 8, *He learned obedience*, and 12 : 2, ἀρχηγὸς τῆς πιστεως, *He who leads the way* (the initiator) *of faith*. Yet this prayer does not imply the least feeling of revolt ; for Jesus is ready to accept the Father's answer, whatever it may be. What if nature rises within Him against this punishment ? this repugnance is legitimate. It was not with the view of suffering thus that man received from God a body and a soul. This resistance of natural instinct to the will of the Spirit—that is to say, to the consciousness of a mission—is exactly what makes it possible for nature to become a real victim, an offering in earnest. So long as the voice of nature is at one with that of God, it may be asked. *Where is the victim for the burnt-offering?* Sacrifice begins where conflict begins. But, at the same time, the holiness of Jesus emerges pure and even perfected from this struggle. Under the most violent pressure, the will of nature did not for a single moment escape from the law of the Spirit, and ended after a time of struggle in being entirely absorbed in it. Luke, like Mark, gives only the first prayer, and confines himself to indicating the others summarily, while Matthew introduces us more profoundly to the *progressive* steps in the submission of Jesus (ver. 42). How much more really *human* do our Gospels make Jesus than our ordinary dogmatics ! It is not thus that the work of invention would have been carried out by a tradition which aimed at deifying Jesus.

The appearance of the angel, ver. 43, is mentioned only by Luke. No doubt this verse is wanting in some Alex. But it is found in 13 Mjj. and in the two oldest translations (Itala and Peschito), and this particular is cited so early as the second century by Justin and Irenæus. It is not very probable that it would have been added. It is more so that, under the influence of the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity, it was omitted on the pretext that it was not found either in Matthew or Mark. Bleek, while fully acknowledging the authenticity of the verse, thinks that this particular was wanting in the primitive Gospel, and that it was introduced by Luke on the faith of a later tradition. Schleiermacher supposes the existence of a poetical writing in which the moral suffering of the Saviour was celebrated, and from which the two vers. 43 and 44 were taken. But tradition, poetry, and myths tend rather to glorify their hero than to impair his honor. The difficulty which orthodoxy finds in accounting for such particulars makes it hard to suppose that it was their inventor. This appearance was not only intended to bring spiritual consolation to Jesus, but physical assistance still more, as in the wilderness. The saying uttered by Him an instant before was no figure of rhetoric : " My soul is exceeding sorrowful *even unto death.*" As when in the wilderness under the pressure of famine, He felt himself dying. The presence of this heavenly being sends a vivifying breath over Him. A divine refreshing pervades Him, body and soul ; and it is thus only that He receives strength to continue to the last the struggle to the physical violence of which He was on the very point of giving way. Ver. 44 shows to what physical prostration Jesus was reduced. This verse is omitted on the one hand, and supported on the other, by the same authorities as the preceding. Is this omission the result of the preceding, or perhaps the consequence of confounding the two καί at the beginning of vers. 44 and 45 ? In either case, there appears to have been here again omission rather than interpolation. The intensity of the struggle becomes so great that it issues in a sort of beginning of physical dissolution. The words, *as it were drops*, express more than a simple comparison between the density of the sweat and that of blood. The words denote that the sweat itself resembled blood. Phenomena of frequent occurrence demonstrate how immediately the blood, the seat of life, is under the empire of moral

impressions. Does not a feeling of shame cause the blood to rise to the face? Cases are known in which the blood, violently agitated by grief, ends by penetrating through the vessels which inclose it, and driven outward, escapes with the sweat through the transpiratory glands.* The reading καταβαίνοντος, in ℵ and some documents of the Itala, though admitted by Tischendorf, has no internal probability. The participle ought to qualify the principal substantive rather than the complement. The disciples themselves might easily remark this appearance when Jesus awoke them, for the full moon was lighting up the garden. They might also hear the first words of Jesus' prayer, for they did not fall asleep immediately, but only, as at the transfiguration (9 : 32), when His prayer was prolonged. Jesus had previously experienced some symptoms precursive of a struggle like to this (12 : 49, 50 ; John 12 : 27). But this time the anguish is such that it is impossible not to recognize the intervention of a supernatural agent. Satan had just invaded the circle of the Twelve by taking possession of the heart of Judas. He was about to sift all the other disciples. Jesus Himself at this time was subjected to his action : "This is the power of darkness," says He, ver. 53. In the words which close his account of the temptation (4 : 13), Luke had expressly declared, "He departed from Him *till a favorable season*," the return of the tempter at a fixed conjuncture.

Vers. 45 and 46. Luke unites the three awakings in one. Then he seeks to explain this mysterious slumber which masters the disciples, and he does so in the way most favorable to them. The cause was not indifference, but rather the prostration of grief. It is well known that deep grief, especially after a period of long and keen tension, disposes to slumber through sheer exhaustion. Nothing could be more opposed than this explanation to the hostile feelings toward the disciples which are ascribed to Luke, and all the more that this particular is entirely peculiar to him. Ver. 46 Jesus rises from this struggle *delivered from His fear*, as says the epistle to the Hebrews ; that is to say, in possession of the profound calm which perfect submission gives to the soul. The punishment has not changed its nature, it is true ; but the impression which the expectation of the cross produces on Jesus is no longer the same. He has given Himself up wholly ; He has done what He Himself proclaimed before passing the Cedron : "For their sakes I sanctify myself" (John 17 : 19) The acceptance of the sacrifice enables Him to feel beforehand the rest belonging to the completion of the sacrifice. Henceforth He walks with a firm step to meet that cross the sight of which an instant before made Him stagger.

SECOND CYCLE.—CHAP. 22 : 47—23 : 46.

The Passion.

The death of Jesus is not simply, in the eyes of the evangelists, and according to the sayings which they put into His mouth, the historical result of the conflict which arose between Him and the theocratic authorities. What happens to Him is that which has been *determined* (22 : 22). Thus *it must* be (Matt. 26 : 54). He Himself sought for a time to struggle against this mysterious necessity by having recourse to that *infinite possibility* which is inseparable from divine liberty (Mark 14 : 36). But the burden has fallen on Him with all its weight, and He is now charged with it. He

* See Langen, pp. 212–214.

dies *for the remission of the sins of the world* (Matt. 26 : 28). The dogmatic system of the apostles contains substantially nothing more. Only it is natural that in the Epistles the divine plan should be more prominent ; in the Gospels, the action of the human factors. The two points of view complete one another : God acts by means of history, and history is the realization of the divine thought.

This cycle embraces the accounts of the arrest of Jesus (22 : 47–53) ; of His twofold trial, ecclesiastical and civil (ver. 54 : 23, 25) ; of His crucifixion (vers. 26–46).

1. *The Arrest of Jesus:* 22 : 47–53.—Three things are included in this piece : 1*st.* The kiss of Judas (vers. 47 and 48) ; 2*d.* The disciples' attempt at defence (vers. 49–51) ; 3*d.* The rebuke which Jesus administers to those who come to take Him (vers. 52 and 53).

Vers. 47 and 48.* The sign which Judas had arranged with the band had for its object to prevent Jesus from escaping should one of His disciples be seized in His stead. In the choice of the sign in itself, as Langen remarks, there was no refinement of hypocrisy. The kiss was the usual form of salutation, especially between disciples and their master. The object of this salutation is not mentioned by Luke ; it was understood. We see from John that the fearless attitude of Jesus, who advanced spontaneously in front of the band rendered this signal superfluous and almost ridiculous. The saying of Jesus to Judas, ver. 48, is somewhat differently reproduced in Matthew ; it is omitted in Mark. In memory of this kiss, the primitive Church suppressed the ceremony of the brotherly kiss on Good Friday. The sole object of the scene which follows in John (the *I am He* of Jesus, with its consequences) was to prevent a disciple from being arrested at the same time.

Vers. 49–51.† The Syn. name neither the disciple who strikes, nor the servant struck. John gives the names of both. So long as the Sanhedrim yet enjoyed its authority, prudence forbade the giving of Peter's name here in the oral narrative. But after his death and the destruction of Jerusalem, John was no longer restrained by the same fears. As to the name of Malchus, it was only preserved in the memory of that disciple who, well known in the house of the high priest, knew the man personally. What are we to think of the author of the fourth Gospel, if these proper names were mere fictions? According to ver. 49, the disciple who struck acted in the name of *all* (*ἰδόντες . . . εἶπον, shall we smite?*). This particular, peculiar to Luke, extenuates Peter's guilt. John says, with Luke : "the right ear." This minute coincidence shows that the details peculiar to Luke are neither legendary nor the inventions of his own imagination. The words *ἐᾶτε ἕως τούτου* supply in Luke the place of a long and important answer of Jesus in Matthew. Should this command be applied to the officers : "Let me go to *this man*" (Paulus) ; or "to *the* spot where this man is?" But this would have required *ἐᾶτε με*, "let *me* go." Or should we understand it, with De Wette, Riggenbach : "Leave me yet for a moment"? The *ἕως, till*, does not lead very naturally to this sense. Besides, the *ἀποκριθείς, answering*, shows that the words of Jesus are connected with the act of the disciple rather than with the arrival of the officers. It is not till ver. 52 that Jesus turns to those who have arrived (*πρὸς τοὺς παραγενομένους*). Here He is addressing the apostles. The

* Ver. 47. 12 Mjj. 15 Mnn. omit *δε* after *ετι*. All the Mjj., *αυτους* (2, *αυτοις*) instead of *αυτων*. D. E. H. X. 60 Mnn. Syr^{sch}. It$^{aliq.}$ add after *αυτον*, *τουτο γαρ σημειον δεδωκει αυτοις, ον αν φιλησω αυτος εστιν* (taken from the parallels).

† Marcion omitted this passage. Ver. 49. ℵ. B. L. T. X. some Mnn. omit *αυτω* before *κυριε*. Ver. 51. ℵ. B. L. R. T. 2 Mnn. omit *αυτου* after *ωτιον*.

meaning is therefore either, "Let these men (the officers) go *thus far* (the length of seizing me)," or (which is more natural), "*Stop there;* strike no such second blow; this one is quite enough." This act of violence, indeed, not only compromised the safety of Peter, but even the Lord's cause. Jesus was all but hindered thereby from addressing Pilate in the words so important for His defence against the crime with which the Jews charged Him (John 18 : 36): "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews." Nothing less was needed than the immediate cure of Malchus to restore the moral situation which had been injured by this trespass, and to enable Jesus to express Himself without the risk of being confounded by facts. This cure is related only by Luke; Meyer therefore relegates it to the domain of myth. But if it had not taken place, it would be impossible to understand how Peter and Jesus Himself had escaped from this complaint.

Vers. 52 and 53.* Among those who came out, Luke numbers some of the chief priests. Whatever Meyer and Bleek may say, such men may surely, out of hatred or curiosity, have accompanied the band charged with the arrest. Besides, is not the rebuke which follows addressed rather to rulers than to subordinates? As to the *captains of the temple*, see 22 : 4. As to the *officers*, comp. John 7 : 45; Acts 5 : 22–26 John speaks, besides, of *the cohort*, 18 : 3, 12; this word, especially when accompanied by the term χιλίαρχος, *tribune*, (ver. 12), and with the antithesis τῶν Ἰουδαίων, can only, in spite of all Bäumlein's objections, designate a detachment of the *Roman cohort;* it was, as Langen remarks, an article of provincial legislation, that no arrest should take place without the intervention of the Romans. The meaning of the rebuke of Jesus is this: "It was from cowardice that you did not arrest me in the full light of day." The other two Syn. carry forward their narrative, like Luke with a *but;* only this *but* is with them the necessity for the fulfilment of the prophecies, while with Luke it is the harmony between the character of the deed and that of the nocturnal hour. Darkness is favorable to crime; for man needs to be concealed not only from others, but from himself, in order to sin. For this reason, night is the time when Satan puts forth all his power over humanity; it is his hour. And hence, adds Jesus, it is also yours, for you are his instruments in the work which you are doing; comp. John 8 : 44, 14 : 30. Luke omits the fact of the apostles' flight which is related here by Matthew and Mark. Where is the malevolence which is ascribed to him against the Twelve? Mark also relates with great circumstantiality, the case of the young man who fled stripped of the linen cloth in which he was wrapped. As, according to Acts 12, the mother of Mark possessed a house in Jerusalem—as this house was the place where the Church gathered in times of persecution, and as it was therefore probably situated in a by-place—it is not impossible that it stood in the vale of Gethsemane, and that this young man was (as has long been supposed) Mark himself, drawn by the noise of the band, and who has thus put his signature as modestly as possible in the corner of the evangelical narrative which he composed.

2. *The Judgment of Jesus:* 22 : 54—23 : 25.

1*st. The Ecclesiastical Trial:* vers. 54–71.—This account contains three things: (1) St. Peter's denial (vers. 54–62); (2) The evil treatment practised by the Jews (vers. 63–65); (3) The sentence of death pronounced by the Sanhedrim (vers. 66–71).

* Ver. 52. ℵ. G. H. R. Δ. 50 Mnn., προς αυτον instead of επ' αυτον. The mss. are divided between εξεληλυθατε (T. R., Byz.), εξηλθατε (Alex.), and εξηλθετε.

Luke places the sitting of the Sanhedrim at which Jesus was condemned in the morning, *when the day dawned* (ver. 66). This morning sitting is also mentioned by Matthew (27 : 1, *the morning was come*) and Mark (15 : 1, *straightway in the morning*). But, according to those two evangelists, a previous sitting had taken place at the house of Caiaphas during the night, of which they give a detailed description (Matt. 26 . 57–66 ; Mark 14 : 53–64). And this even, according to John, had been preceded by a preparatory sitting at the house of Annas, the father-in-law of Caiaphas. John does not relate either the second or the third sitting, though he expressly indicates the place of the latter by the πρῶτον, 18 : 13, and the notice, 18 · 24. This, then, is the order of events : Immediately on His arrest, between one and three o'clock, Jesus was led to the house of Annas, where a preliminary inquiry took place, intended to extract beforehand some saying which would serve as a text for His-condemnation (John 18 : 19–23). This sitting having terminated without any positive result, had not been taken up by tradition, and was omitted by the Syn. But John relates it to complete the view of the trial of Jesus, and with regard to the account of Peter's denial, which he wishes to restore to its true light. During this examination, the members of the Sanhedrim had been called together in haste, in as large numbers as possible, to the house of the high priest. The sitting of this body which followed was that at which Jesus was condemned to death for having declared Himself to be the Son of God. It must have taken place about three o'clock in the morning. Matthew (26 : 59, *et seq.*) and Mark (14 : 55, *et seq.*) have minutely described it. John has omitted it, as sufficiently known through them. In the morning, at daybreak, the Sanhedrim assembled anew, this time in full muster, and in their official hall near the temple. This is the sitting described by Luke, and briefly indicated, as we have seen, by Matthew and Mark. Two things rendered it necessary : (1) According to a Rabbinical law, no sentence of death passed during the night was valid.* To this formal reason there was probably added the circumstance that the sentence had not been passed in the official place. But especially (2) it was necessary to deliberate seriously on the ways and means by which to obtain from the Roman governor the confirmation and execution of their sentence. The whole negotiation with Pilate which follows shows that the thing was far from easy, and betrays on the part of the Jews, as we have seen in our " Comment. sur l'évang. de Jean," a strategical plan completely marked out beforehand. It was no doubt at this morning sitting that the plan was discussed and adopted. Matthew also says, in speaking of this last sitting (27 : 1), that they took counsel ὥστε θανατῶσαι αὐτόν, *about the way of getting Him put to death.* Then it was that Judas came to restore his money to the Sanhedrim *in the temple* (ἐν τῷ ναῷ, Matt. 27 : 5).

Bleek admits only two sittings in all—the one preliminary, which was held at the house of Annas (John), and during which Peter's denial took place ; the other official, decisive, in which the whole Sanhedrim took part, related by the Syn., who erroneously connect Peter's denial with it, and which is divided also erroneously by Matthew and Mark into two distinct sittings. Langen, on the contrary, with many commentators, identifies the examination before Annas (John 18 : 13, 19–23) with the nocturnal sitting which is described in detail by Matthew and Mark. Against this

* " Sanhedrim," 9. 1. Langen objects that, according to this same passage, the pronouncing of sentence should have been deferred till the second day. But it was easier to elude this second law than the former. It was possible, for graver reasons, to decree urgency.

explanation there are: 1. The entire difference between the matter of the two sittings; in John, a simple examination without judgment; in Matthew and Mark, the express pronouncing of a capital sentence; 2. Ver. 24 of John, "Annas sent Jesus bound to Caiaphas"—a verse which, whatever may be made of it, implies two sittings, the one at the house of Annas, the other at the house of Caiaphas, in the same night. The opinion of Bleek would be more allowable. But we should be authorized in ascribing to the first two Syn. the serious confusion, and then the false division, which Bleek imputes to them, only if the two sittings of the night and morning could not be sufficiently accounted for. Now, we have just seen that it is quite otherwise. A minute particular which distinguishes them confirms their historical reality: in the night sitting there had been unanimity (Mark 14 : 64). Now, if Luke is not mistaken in declaring, 23 : 51, that Joseph of Arimathea did not vote with the majority, we must conclude that he was not present at the night sitting at the house of Caiaphas, but that he took part only in that of the morning in the temple, which agrees with the fact that Matthew (27 : 1) expressly distinguishes the morning assembly as a plenary court, by the adjective πάντες, *all*. The two sittings are thus really distinct. Luke has mentioned only the last, that of the morning, perhaps because it was only the sentence pronounced then for the second time which had *legal force*, and which therefore was the only one mentioned by his sources.

(1.) Vers. 54–62.* *Peter's Denial.*—The account of the evangelists presents insoluble difficulties, if Annas and Caiaphas dwelt in different houses. Indeed, according to Matthew and Mark, who do not mention the examination before Annas, it is at the house of Caiaphas that the denial must have taken place; while according to John, who does not relate the sitting at the house of Caiaphas, it is at the house of Annas that this scene must have occurred. But is it impossible, or even improbable, that Annas and Caiaphas his son-in-law occupied the sacerdotal palace in common? Annas and Caiaphas, high priests, the one till the year 14, the other from the year 17, were so identified in popular opinion that Luke (3 : 2) mentions them as exercising one and the same pontificate in common—the one as titulary high priest, the other as high priest *de facto*. So Acts 4 : 6: *Annas the high priest and Caiaphas.*† But there is more than a possibility or a probability. There is a fact: in John 18 : 15, the entrance of Peter into the palace where the denial took place is explained on the ground that John was known to the high priest, a title which in this context (vers. 13 and 24) can designate no other than Caiaphas; and yet, according to ver. 12, it is the house of Annas which is in question. How are we to explain this account, if Annas and Caiaphas did not inhabit the same house? There is caution in the way in which Luke expresses himself: "They led Him *into the high priest's house*;" he does

* Ver. 54. 10 Mjj. 30 Mnn. It. Vg. omit αυτον after εισηγαγον. 7 Mjj. 10 Mnn., την οικιαν instead of τον οικον. Ver. 55. ℵ. B. L. T., περιαψαντων instead of αψαντων. 7 Mjj. It^{plerique}, omit αυτων after συγκαθισαντων. B. L. T. 2 Mnn., μεσος instead of εν μεσω. Ver. 57. 9 Mjj. 40 Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique}, omit αυτον after ηρνησατο. Ver. 58. 7 Mjj. 15 Mnn., εφη instead of ειπεν. Ver. 60. ℵ. D. It. Vg., τι λεγεις instead of ο λεγεις. All the Mjj. many Mnn. omit ο before αλεκτωρ. Ver. 61. ℵ. B. L. T. X. some Mnn., instead of τον λογον, του ρηματος (taken from Matthew and Mark). 8 Mjj. 25 Mnn. read σημερον before απαρνησῃ. Ver. 62. 9 Mjj. 50 Mnn. Syr^{rec}. omit ο Πετρος after εξω.

† In this passage, the name High Priest is used in the *general* sense which it has throughout the N. T., and Annas is named at the head of the list as president of the Sanhedrim.

not say, to the house of *Caiaphas* (Matthew), or to *the presence of the* high priest (Mark), but to the *sacerdotal palace,* where dwelt the two high priests closely united and related.

A covered gateway (πυλών) led from without into the court where the fire was lighted (αὐλή). The first denial is related by John in a way to show that it took place *during* the appearance before Annas. Comp. the repetition 18 : 18 and 25, which is indirectly intended to show that the denial was simultaneous with that first sitting. The other two denials being placed by John *after* the sitting, took place consequently between the appearance at the house of Annas and the sitting of the Sanhedrim at the house of Caiaphas. After his first sin, Peter, humbled, and, as it were, afraid of himself, had withdrawn to the gateway (πυλών, Matthew), or to *the outer court* (προαύλιον, Mark), situated before the gateway. There, though more secluded, he is the object of petty persecution on the part of the porteress who had let him in (Mark), of another female servant (Matthew), of *another* individual (ἕτερος, Luke), of the bystanders in general (εἶπον, *they said*, John). The accusation began probably with the porteress, who knew his intimate connection with John ; she betrayed him to another servant ; and the latter pointed him out to the domestics. Finally, about an hour later (Luke), a kinsman of Malchus (John) recognizes him, and engages him in a conversation. Peter's answer makes him known as a Galilean, and consequently as a disciple of Jesus. And the third denial takes place ; the cock crows (Matthew, Luke, John) for the second time (Mark). Then Peter, awaking as from a dream, at the moment when he lifts his head, meets the eye of Jesus (Luke). How could the Lord be there? It was the time when, after the examination before Annas, they were leading Him to the sitting of the Sanhedrim before Caiaphas. He was just crossing the court which divided the two sets of apartments ; and this is what John means to express by introducing *here* the remark, 18 : 24 : "Now Annas had sent Him bound to Caiaphas." We can understand the profound effect produced upon the disciple by the sight of his Master *bound,* and the look which He gave him in passing. Mark omits this particular ; Peter was not likely to relate it in his preaching. Mark merely says : ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιε (the imperfect), *hurrying forth, he wept,* went on weeping without ceasing. The other Gospels simply use the aor. *he wept.* Then it was that he was preserved from despair and its consequences by the intercession of his Master : "I have prayed for thee . . ." The answer to the prayer of Jesus was given partly by this look—a look of pardon as well as of rebuke, which raised the poor disciple, while breaking his heart with contrition. It was thereby that God sustained his faith, and prevented him from falling into a state similar to that of Judas.

We recognize in the three Syn. accounts the characteristic of traditional narrative in their combining the three denials in a single description ; it was the ἀπομνημόνευμα, *the recital,* of the denial. John, as an eye-witness, has given the historical fact its natural divisions. But notwithstanding their common type, each Syn. account has also its delicate shades and special features, rendering it impossible to derive it from the same written source as the other two. Matthew is the writer who best exhibits the gradation of the three denials (as in Gethsemane that of the three prayers of Jesus).

(2.) Vers. 63–65.* The evil treatment mentioned here is the same as that related

* Ver. 63. 7 Mjj. some Mnn. It. Vg., αυτον instead of τον Ιησουν. Ver. 64. ℵ. B. K. L. M. T. Π., περικαλυψαντες αυτον instead of περικ. αυτ. ετυπτον αυτ. τ. προσ. και. 7 Mjj. omit αυτον after επηρωτων.

by Matthew and Mark, and placed by them after the sitting of the Sanhedrim at the house of Caiaphas. It is the parody of the *prophetic* knowledge of Jesus, the ridicule of the *Jews*. We shall afterward see the derision of the Gentiles.

(3.) Vers. 66–71.* *The Morning Sitting.*—It is impossible to determine to what extent the Sanhedrim required to repeat in their morning sitting what had passed in the night one. But we are justified in allowing that some details of the one were applied to the other by tradition and by our evangelists. There was nothing in itself blasphemous in one calling himself the Christ. This claim, even if it was false, was not an outrage on the honor of God. If the assertions of Jesus regarding His person appeared in the judgment of the Jews to be blasphemy, it was because in His mouth the title *Son of God* always signified something else and something more than that of *Messiah*, and because the latter was in His lips only a corollary from the former. In proportion to the care with which Jesus in His ministry had avoided making His Messiahship the subject of His public declarations, He had pointedly designated Himself as the *Son of God*. Hence, in the sitting described by Matthew and Mark, the high priest, when putting to Him the question: "Art thou *the Christ?*" takes care to add: "the Son of God?" well knowing that the first assertion cannot be the foundation of a capital charge, unless it be again completed and explained as it had always been in the teaching of Jesus by the second. The question of ver. 67, in Luke, was simply, on the part of the high priest, the introduction to the examination (comp. ver. 70). But Jesus, wishing to hasten a decision which He knew to be already taken, boldly and spontaneously passes in His answer beyond the strict contents of the question, and declares Himself not only the Messiah, but at the same time the Son of man sharing the divine glory. The particle εἰ (ver. 67) may be taken interrogatively: "Art thou the Christ? Tell us so in that case." But it is more natural to make it directly dependent on εἰπε: "Tell us *if thou art* . . ." De Wette has criticised the answer here ascribed to Jesus (vers. 67 and 68). The second alternative: *If I ask you*, appears to him out of place in the mouth of an accused person. It is not so. Here is the position, as brought out by the answer of Jesus: "I cannot address you either as judges whom I am seeking to convince, for you are already determined to put no faith in my declarations, nor as disciples whom I am endeavoring to instruct, for you would not enter into a fair discussion with me." Had he not questioned them once and again previously on the origin of John's baptism, and on the meaning of Ps. 110? And they had steadily maintained a prudent silence! Jesus foresees the same result, if He should now enter into discussion with them. The last words: ἢ ἀπολύσητε, *nor let me go*, are perplexing, because, while grammatically connected with the second alternative, they refer in sense to both. Either, with the Alex., they must be rejected, or they must be taken as a climax: "Nor *far less still* will ye let me go."

Ver. 69. Jesus Himself thus furnishes the Jews with the hold which they seek. The name *Son of Man*, which He uses as most directly connected with that of Christ (ver. 67), is qualified by a description implying that He who bears this title participates in the divine state. Thereby the trial became singularly shortened. There was no occasion searchingly to examine the right of Jesus to the title of Christ. The

* Ver. 66. ℵ. B. D. K. T. 25 Mnn. Or., απηγαγον instead of ανηγαγον. ℵ. B. L. T., ειπον instead of ειπε. Ver. 68. ℵ. B. L. T. omit και after εαν δε. ℵ. B. L. T. omit the words μοι η απολυσητε. Ver. 69. 7 Mjj. It^{plerique}, Vg. add δε after νυν.

claim to divine glory contained in this assertion of Jesus is immediately formulated by the tribunal in the title *Son of God*. It only remains to have the blasphemy articulately stated by the culprit Himself. Hence the collective question, ver. 70. The form : *ye say that I am, thou sayest it*, is not used in Greek ; but it is frequently used in Rabbinical language.* By such an answer the party accepts *as His own affirmation*, the whole contents of the question put to Him. So far, therefore, from this question proving, as is persistently affirmed, that the name *Son of God* is equivalent in the view of the Jews, or in that of Jesus, to the name *Christ*, the evident progress from the question of ver. 67 to that of ver. 70, brought about by the decided answer of Jesus, ver. 69, clearly proves the difference between the two terms. As to the difference between the night sitting and that of the morning, it was not considerable. In the second, the steps were only more summary, and led more quickly to the end. All that was necessary was to ratify officially what had been done during the night. As Keim says, "the Sanhedrim had not to discuss ; they had merely to approve and confirm the decision come to over-night." In the opinion of those who allege that Jesus was crucified on the afternoon of the 15th, and not of the 14th, the arrest of Jesus, and the three judicial sessions which followed, took place in the night between the 14th and 15th, and so on the sabbatic holy day. Is that admissible? Langen remarks that on the 15th Nisan food might be prepared, which was forbidden on a Sabbath (Ex. 12 : 16). But there is no proof that this exception extended to other acts of ordinary life (arrests, judgments, punishments, etc.). He seeks, further, to prove that what was forbidden on a sabbatic day was not to *pronounce* a sentence, but merely *to write* and *execute it*. Now, he says, there is no proof that the sentence of Jesus was written ; and it was Roman soldiers, not subject to the law, by whom it was executed. These replies are ingenious ; but after all, the objection taken from the general sabbatic character of the 15th Nisan remains in all its force.

2*d. The Civil Judgment :* 23 : 1-25.—Here we have the description, on the one hand, of the series of manœuvres used by the Jews to obtain from Pilate the execution of the sentence, and on the other, of the series of Pilate's expedients, or counter-manœuvres, to get rid of the case which was forced on him. He knew that it was out of envy that the chiefs among the Jews were delivering Jesus over to him (Matt. 27 : 18 ; Mark 15 : 10), and he felt repugnance at lending his power to a judicial murder. Besides, he felt a secret fear about Jesus. Comp. John 19 : 8, where it is said : "When Pilate therefore heard that saying ('He made Himself the Son of God'), he was the more afraid ;" and the question, ver. 9 : *Whence art thou?*—a question which cannot refer to the earthly birthplace of Jesus—that was already known to him (Luke 23 : 6), and which can only signify in the context : From heaven or from earth ? The message of his wife (Matt. 27 : 19) must have contributed to increase the superstitious fears which he felt.

Vers. 1–5.† Since Judea had been reduced to a Roman province, on the deposition of Archelaus, in the year seven of our era, the Jewish authorities had lost the *jus gladii*, which the Romans always reserved to themselves in the provinces incorporated with the empire. Perhaps, as Langen concludes, with some probability, from John

* A very similar assenting affirmation is common in English-speaking society. "So you may say" is a strong indorsement of something already uttered.—J. H.

† Ver. 1. All the Mjj., ηγαγον instead of ηγαγεν (T. R.). Ver. 2. 10 Mjj. 60 Mnn. Syr. It. Vg. add ημων after εθνος. ℵ. B. L. T. Syr. It^plerique, Vg., add και before λεγοντα. Ver. 5. ℵ. B. L. T. Syr. add και before αρξαμενος.

18 : 30, 31, previous governors had relaxed the rigor of public right on this point, and Pilate was the first who had confined the Jews within their strict legal competency. There is a tradition, quoted in the Talmud, that "forty years before the destruction of the temple (and so about the year thirty of our era), the right of pronouncing capital sentences was taken from Israel" (Cant. 24. 2). Thus is explained the procedure of the Jews (ver. 1) who bring Jesus before Pilate. The other motives by which it has been sought to explain it, such as the desire to put the entire responsibility of this death on Pilate (Mosheim), or that of getting Jesus put to death by the Roman and specially cruel punishment of the cross (Chrysostom), or finally, that of not violating the quiet of the feast (Augustine), have been refuted by Langen (pp. 246–251). It cannot be decided with certainty whether Pilate at this time resided in the palace of Herod the Great, on the hill of Sion, or in the citadel Antonia, at the north-west of the temple. Tradition makes the Via Dolorosa begin at this latter spot. The complaint uttered by the Jews, ver. 2, was not the actual beginning of this long negotiation. John alone has preserved to us its true commencement (18 : 29–32). The Jews began very skilfully by trying to get Pilate to execute the sentence without having submitted it for his confirmation. The latter, more adroit than they, and eagerly profiting by the turn thus given to the case, declared to them that he was well pleased not to interfere in the matter, and that he left Jesus in their hands, that is to say, within the limits of their competency (the execution of purely Jewish penalties—excommunication from the synagogue, scourging, etc.). But that did not come up to the reckoning of the Jews, who wished at any price the death of Jesus. They must therefore abandon the exalted position which they had attempted to take, and submit their sentence to be judged by Pilate.

Here begins the second manœuvre, the political accusation (Luke, ver. 2 ; comp. the three other accounts which are parallel). This charge was a notorious falsehood ; for Jesus had resolved in the affirmative the question whether tribute should be paid to Cæsar, and had carefully abstained from everything which could excite a rising of the people. The semblance of truth which is required in every accusation was solely in the last words : *He made Himself the Christ*, a title which they maliciously explained by that of *king*. They began by giving to the name Christ a political color in the mouth of Jesus. Hence they conclude that He was bound to forbid the payment of tribute. If He did not actually do so, He should have done it logically. Therefore it was as if He had done it ; the crime may be justly imputed to Him. This translation of the title *Christ* by that of *king* before Pilate is especially remarkable, if we compare it with the transformation of the same title into that of *Son of God* before the Sanhedrim. The object of the one was to establish the accusation of rebellion, as that of the other was to prove the charge of blasphemy. There is a versatility in this hatred. The four narratives agree in the question which Pilate addresses to Jesus. We know from John that Jesus was in the prætorium, while the Jews took their stand in the open square ; Pilate went from them to Him, and from Him to them. The brief answer of Jesus : *Thou sayest it*, is surprising. But it appears from John that the word is only the summary of a conversation of some length between Jesus and Pilate—a conversation which oral tradition had not preserved. Pilate was intelligent enough to know what to think of the sudden zeal manifested by the Sanhedrim for the Roman dominion in Palestine, and the conversation which he had with Jesus on this first head of accusation (John 18 : 33–38) resulted in convincing him that he had not to do with a rival of Cæsar. He therefore declares to the Jews that

their accusation is unfounded. But they insist (ver. 5), and advance as a proof the sort of popular movement of which Galilee was the starting-point (ἀρξάμενος), and which spread quite recently to the very gates of Jerusalem (ἕως ὧδε)—an allusion to the Palm Days. It is to the mention of this new charge that we may apply Matt. 27 : 12 and Mark 15 : 3, 4, where there is indicated a repetition of accusations which Jesus answered only by silence. Luke also declares, ver. 5, *that they were the more fierce*. A second expedient then presents itself to Pilate's mind: to consign the whole matter to Herod, the sovereign of Galilee (vers 6–12).

Vers. 6–12.* Luke alone relates this remarkable circumstance. By this step the clever Roman gained two ends at once. First he got rid of the business which was imposed on him, and then he took the first step toward a reconciliation with Herod (ver. 12). The cause of their quarrel had probably been some conflict of jurisdiction. In that case, was not the best means of soldering up the quarrel to concede to him a right of jurisdiction within the very city of Jerusalem? Herod had come to the capital, like Pilate, on account of the feast; ordinarily he lived in the old castle of the Asmonean kings, on the hill of Zion. Jesus was to him what a skilful juggler is to a seated court—an object of curiosity. But Jesus did not lend Himself to such a part; He had neither words nor miracles for a man so disposed, in whom, besides, He saw with horror the murderer of John the Baptist. Before this personage, a monstrous mixture of bloody levity and sombre superstition, He maintained a silence which even the accusations of the Sanhedrim (ver. 10) could not lead Him to break. Herod, wounded and humiliated, took vengeance on this conduct by contempt. The expression, *a gorgeous robe* (ver. 11), denotes not a purple garment, but a white mantle, like that worn by Jewish kings and Roman grandees on high occasions.† We cannot see in this, with Riggenbach, a contemptuous allusion to the white robe of the high priest. It was a parody of the royal claims of Jesus, but at the same time an indirect declaration of His innocence, at least in a political point of view. The στρατεύματα, *soldiers* of Herod, can only mean his attendants, his body-guard, who were allowed to accompany him in the capital.

Vers. 13–19. ‡ Not having succeeded in this way, Pilate finds himself reduced to seek another expedient. Two present themselves to his mind: first, the offer to chastise Jesus—that is to say, to scourge Him; then the proposition to release Him as a pardoned malefactor, according to the custom of the feast. The penalty of scourging strictly formed part of the punishment of crucifixion; it was the imperative preliminary. Jerome says (in Matt. 27): *Sciendum est Pilatum romanis legibus ministrasse, quibus sancitum erat ut qui crucifigeretur, prius flagellis verberetur* (Langen, p.

* Ver. 6. ℵ. B. L. T. omit Γαλιλαιαν before επερωτησεν. Ver. 8. B. D. L. T., εξ ικανων χρονων instead of εξ ικανου (T. R., Byz.) or εξ ικανου χρονου (4 Mjj. Syr. Itplerique.) 8 Mjj. some Mnn. Syrcur. omit πολλα after ακουειν. Ver. 11. ℵ. B. L. T. omit αυτον after περιβαλων. ℵ* L. R., επεμψεν instead of ανεπεμψεν. Ver. 12. ℵ. B. L. T., αυτους instead of εαυτους.

† Langen, p. 270, note (Josephus, Bell. Jud. ii. 1. 1; Tacitus, Hist. ii. 89).

‡ Ver. 14. ℵ. A. L. X. some Mnn. omit κατ' before αυτον. Ver. 15. ℵ. B. K. L M. T. Π. several Mnn., ανεπεμψεν γαρ αυτον προς ημας instead of ανεπεμψα γαρ υμας προς αυτον, which T. R. reads, with 12 Mjj. the most of the Mnn. Itplerique, Vg. and Syr. (which substitutes αυτον for υμας). Ver. 17. A. B. K. L. T. Π. a Fuld. Sah. omit this verse. D. Syrcur. place it after ver. 19. Ver. 18. ℵ. B. L. T. 2 Mnn., ανεκραγον instead of ανεκραξαν. Ver. 19. B. L. T., βληθεις instead of βεβλημενος. ℵ. B. L. T. X., εν τη φυλακη instead of εις φυλακην.

281). This previous punishment was often mortal.* In this case Pilate offered it to the Jews in place of crucifixion, not as the first act of that punishment. He hoped that at the sight of this the more moderate would be satisfied, and that the last act would not be demanded of him. But to secure the certainty of this means he combines it with the other. The time was come for releasing a state prisoner, as was common at the feast. He reckons on the numerous adherents of Jesus who had welcomed Him with acclamations on Palm Day, and whose voices, in spite of the rulers, would make themselves heard in demanding His release.

At ver. 15, Tischendorf prefers the Alex. reading: "For he sent him to us," instead of, "For I sent you to him." But this reading has arisen from an entire misunderstanding of the following phrase. It was translated, "And, lo! nothing is done unto him (at Herod's court) to show that he has been judged worthy of death;" while the Greek expression signifies, according to a well-known construction, "And, lo! he is found to have done nothing (He, Jesus) which was worthy of death [in Herod's conviction as well as in mine]." The received reading is therefore indisputably the true one. Pilate declares aloud that the result of this whole series of inquiries has been to establish the innocence of Jesus. But why in this case conclude, as he does (*therefore*, ver. 16), by offering to scourge Him, thereafter to release Him? It was already a denial of justice to send Jesus to Herod after having acknowledged His innocence; it is a more flagrant one still to decree against Him, without any alleged reason, the penalty of scourging. This first concession betrays his weakness, and gives him over beforehand to his adversaries, who are more decided than he. If ver. 17 is authentic, and if it is to be put here (see the critical note), the most natural connection between vers. 16 and 17 is this: "I will release him; for I am even under obligation to release unto you a prisoner." Pilate affects to have no doubt that, when the liberation of a prisoner is offered to the people, they will claim Jesus. But if this verse is rejected as unauthentic, we must recognize in the ἀπολύσω, *I will release*, ver. 16, a positive allusion to the custom of releasing a prisoner. At ver. 18, the Jews, understanding in a moment Pilate's idea, would reply to him by putting themselves at his view-point. But this explanation is somewhat forced, and the omission of ver. 17 may have arisen in the Alex. from confounding the two AN . . . which begin the two verses 17 and 18. In John, Pilate, while reminding the people of this custom, directly offers them the deliverance of Jesus. This was probably the real course of events. In Matthew, he puts the alternative between Jesus and Barabbas, which is less natural. In Mark, it is the people who, interrupting the deliberation relative to Jesus, all at once claim the liberation of a prisoner, which is less natural still. The origin of the custom here mentioned is not known. It is far from probable that it was introduced by the Romans. Langen justly quotes against this supposition the words of Pilate (John 18 : 39), "Ye have a custom." Perhaps it was a memorial of the great national deliverance, of the escape from Egypt, which was celebrated at the feast of Passover. The Romans, who took a pride in respecting the usages of conquered peoples, had fallen in with this custom.

But before Pilate had carried out the scourging, the people had already made their choice. This choice is presented, ver. 18, as unanimous and spontaneous (παμπληθεί), while Matthew and Mark, more accurate on the point, ascribe it to the pressure exercised by the rulers and their underlings, which harmonizes with John 19 · 6

* Cicero, in Flaccum, § 10.

Mark and Luke characterize Barabbas as one who had been guilty of murder in an insurrection ; he was therefore a representative of the same revolutionary spirit of which the Sanhedrim were accusing Jesus. To give up Jesus to the cross, and to demand Barabbas, was to do at the same moment two significant acts. It was to repudiate the spirit of submission and faith which had distinguished the whole work of Jesus, and which might have saved the people. It was at the same time to let loose the spirit of revolt which was to carry them to their destruction. The name Barabbas comes from בר and אבא (*son of the father*). This name signifies, according to most, *son of Abba*, of God. Keim understands son of the Rabbin, taken as spiritual father. The name Jesus, which is also given to this man in 4 Mnn. of Matthew, and which was found, according to the Fathers, in a considerable number of MSS., was probably added to the name of Barabbas, with the desire to render the parallelism the more striking.

The liberation of Barabbas was a judicial act ; to carry it out, Pilate must ascend his judgment-seat. It was probably at this moment that the message of his wife, of which Matthew speaks (ver. 19, "When he was set down on the judgment-seat"), was transmitted to him.

Vers. 20–25.* This manœuvre having failed, Pilate returns to the expedient on which he reckons most : he will try to satisfy the anger of the most infuriated, and to excite the pity of those who are yet capable of this feeling, by a beginning of punishment. The real contents of the declaration announced by the προσεφώνησε, *he spake again to them*, ver. 20, are not expressed till the end of ver. 22 : "I will therefore chastise him, and let him go." But Pilate is interrupted before having uttered his whole thought by the cries of the Jews, ver. 21 ; his answer, ver. 22, breathes indignation. By the τρίτον, *for the third time*, allusion is made to his two previous declarations, ver. 4 and vers. 14, 15. Γάρ bears on the idea of crucifixion, ver. 21 : "Crucify him? For he has done . . . what evil?" But this indignation of Pilate is only an example of cowardice. Why scourge Him whom he acknowledges to be innocent? This first weakness is appreciated and immediately turned to account by the Jews. † It is here, in Luke's account, that the scourging should be placed. John, who has left the most vivid recital of this scene, places it exactly at this moment. According to Matthew and Mark, the scourging did not take place till after the sentence was pronounced, agreeably to custom, and as the first stage of crucifixion. Ver. 23 summarizes a whole series of negotiations, the various phases of which John alone has preserved to us (19 . 1–12). Jesus, covered with blood, appears before the people. But the rulers and their partisans succeed in extinguishing the voice of pity in the multitude. Pilate, who reckoned on the effect of the spectacle, is shocked at this excess of cruelty. He authorizes them to carry out the crucifixion themselves at their own risk ; they decline. They understand that it is he who serves as their executioner. To gain him there remain yet two ways. All at once changing their tactics, they demand the death of Jesus as a blasphemer : "He made

* Ver. 20. 6 Mjj. 2 Mnn. Vss., δε instead of ουν. ℵ. B. L. T. 2 Mnn. add αυτοις after προσεφωνησεν. Ver. 21. ℵ. B. D. F^{a} Or., σταυρου, σταυρου, instead of σταυρωσον, σταυρωσον. Ver. 23. ℵ. B. L. 130 Mnn. Iplerique omit και των αρχιερεων after αυτων. Ver. 25. 16 Mjj. many Mnn. omit αυτοις after απελυσεν δε.

† In the "Scripture Characters" of the late Dr. Candlish, of Edinburgh, three chapters of singularly clear analysis are devoted to Pilate. They well deserve study. —J. H.

himself the Son of God." But on hearing this accusation, Pilate shows himself still less disposed to condemn Jesus, whose person had already inspired him with a mysterious fear. The Jews then determine to employ the weapon which they had kept to the last, probably as the most ignoble in their own eyes, that of personal intimidation. They threaten him with an accusation before the emperor, as having taken a rebel under his protection. Pilate knows how ready Tiberius will be to welcome such a charge. On hearing this threat, he understands at once, that if he wishes to save his place and life, he has no alternative but to yield. It is at this point that the four narratives again unite. Pilate for the second time ascends the judgment-seat, which was set up in a raised place in the open square situated before the prætorium. He washes his hands (Matthew), and again declining all participation in the judicial murder which is about to be committed, he delivers Jesus over to His enemies.

Ver. 25 of Luke is the only passage of this narrative where the feelings of the historian break through the objectivity of the narrative. The details repeated here (ver. 19) regarding the character of Barabbas bring into prominence all that is odious in the choice of Israel; and the words, *he delivered Him to their will*, all the cowardice of the judge who thus declines to act as the protector of innocence. Matthew and Mark here narrate the abuse which Jesus had to suffer from the Roman soldiers; it is the scene related John 19 : 1-3, and which should be placed before the scourging. The scene of it, according to Mark, was the inner court of the prætorium, which agrees with John. It was less the mockery of Jesus Himself than of the Jewish Messiah in His person.

3. *The Crucifixion of Jesus:* 23 : 26-46.—John indicates, as the time when Pilate pronounced sentence, the sixth hour; Mark, as the hour at which Jesus was crucified, the third. According to the ordinary mode of reckoning time among the ancients (starting from six o'clock in the morning), it would be midday with the first, nine o'clock in the morning with the second. The contradiction seems flagrant: Jesus condemned at noon, according to John, and crucified at nine according to Mark! Langen brings new arguments to support an attempt at harmony which has often been made—that John reckoned the hours as we do, that is to say, starting from midnight. The sixth hour would then be with him six o'clock in the morning, which would harmonize a little better with Mark's date, the interval between six and nine o'clock being employed in preparations for the crucifixion.* But is it probable that John adopted a mode of reckoning different from that which was generally in use, and that without in the least apprising his readers?† We incline rather to

* Langen rests his argument on three passages, one from the "Natural History" of Pliny the elder (ii. 70), the second from the Letters of Pliny the younger (iii. 5), the third from the Acts of Polycarp's martyrdom (c. 7), proving that at the beginning of the Christian era our present mode of reckoning (starting from midnight and midday) was already known. The third passage really possesses great force; and it is the more important, because it proceeds from the very country in which John wrote.

† We owe to M. André Cherbuliez, of Geneva, and M. de Rougemont, who sent it to us, an interesting contribution on this question, taken from the "Sacred Discourses" of Ælius Aristides, a Greek sophist of the second century, a contemporary of Polycarp, whom he may have met in the streets of Smyrna. In the first book God commands him in a dream to take a cold bath; it is winter; and as the most suitable hour he chooses the sixth, undoubtedly because it is the warmest. Then, addressing his friend Bassus, who keeps him waiting, he says to him, pointing to the pillars, "Seest thou? the shadow is already turning." There is no doubt, therefore, that the sixth hour with him denotes midday, and not six o'clock morning or evening

hold with Lange, in his "Life of Jesus," that Mark dated the beginning of the punishment from the time of the scourging, which legally formed its first act. In this Mark followed an opinion which naturally arose from the connection in which scourging was ordinarily practised. It is John who, by his more exact knowledge of the whole course of the trial, has placed this part of the punishment of Jesus at its true time and in its true light The scourging, in Pilate's view, was not the beginning of the crucifixion, but rather a means of preventing it. Thus it is that Mark has antedated the crucifixion by the whole interval which divided the scene of the *Ecce homo* from the pronouncing of the sentence and its execution. It is absolutely impossible to suppose that the whole long and complicated negotiation between the Jews and Pilate took place between the last sitting of the Sanhedrim (which was held *as soon as it was day*, Luke 22 : 66) and six o'clock in the morning. See my 'Comment. sur Jean," ii. pp. 606 and 607.

The punishment of crucifixion was in use among several ancient peoples (Persians, Assyrians, Egyptians, Indians, Scythians, Greeks). Among the Romans, it was used only for slaves (*servile supplicium*, Horace), and for the greatest criminals (assassins, brigands, rebels). It was abolished by Constantine. The scourging took place either before setting out, or on the way to the cross (Liv. xxxiii. 36). According to Plutarch* every criminal carried his own cross. There was borne before him or hung round his neck a white plate, on which his crime was indicated (*titulus*, σανίς, *αἰτία*). The punishment took place, as a rule, beyond inhabited houses,† near a road, that the largest possible number of people might witness it. The Talmud of Jerusalem relates that before crucifixion there was offered to the prisoner a stupefying draught, which compassionate people, generally ladies of Jerusalem, prepared at their own cost.‡ The cross consisted of two pieces, the one perpendicular (*staticulum*), the other horizontal (*antenna*). Nearly at the middle of the first was fixed a pin of wood or horn (πῆμα,§ *sedile*), on which the prisoner rested as on horseback.‖ Otherwise the weight would have torn the hands and left the body to fall. They began ordinarily by setting up and fixing the cross (Cic. Verr. v. 66 ; Jos. "Bell. Jud." vii. 6. 4) ; then by means of cords the body was raised to the height of *the antenna*, and the nails driven into the hands. The condemned person was rarely nailed to the cross while it was yet lying on the ground, to be afterward raised. The cross does not seem to have been very high. Langen thinks that it was twice the height of a man : that is the maximum ; and it is probable that generally it was not so high. The rod of hyssop on which the sponge was held out to Jesus could not be more than two or three feet in length. As to the feet, Paulus, Lücke, Winer, and others have more or less positively denied that they were nailed. They appeal to John 20 : 25 But would it not have been singular pedantry on the part of Thomas to speak here of the holes *in the feet?* He enumerates the wounds, which were immediately within reach of his hand. It is the same when Jesus speaks to Thomas, ver. 27. Then they allege the fact that the Empress Helena, after having

* "De serâ Numinis vindictâ," c. 9.

† Plautus, "Miles gloriosus," ii. 4. 6 : *extra portam.*

‡ "Bab. Sanh." f. 43. 1 : "A grain of frankincense in a cup of wine ; *ut turbaretur ejus intellectus.*"

§ Ir. "Adv. Hær." ii. 42.

‖ Justin Martyr, "Dial." 91 : ἐφ' ᾧ ἐποιχοῦνται οἱ σταυρώμενοι. Irenæus, "Adv. Hær." ii. 42. Tertullian, "Cont. Marc." iii. 18.

discovered the true cross, sent to her son the nails which had been fastened in the *hands* of Christ.* But it is not said that she sent to him all that she had found. The contrary rather appears from the tenor of the narrative (see Meyer, ad Matt. 27 : 35). Hug, Meyer, Langen have proved beyond doubt, by a series of quotations from Xenophon, Plautus, Lucian, Justin, Tertullian, etc., that the custom was to nail the feet also ; and Luke 24 : 39 (written without the least reference to the prophecy of Ps. 22) admits of no doubt that this practice was followed in the case of Jesus. For how could His feet have served as a proof of His identity (*ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐγώ*) otherwise than by the wounds the mark of which they bore? The small board (*suppedaneum*), on which the representations of the crucifixion usually make the feet of our Lord rest, is a later invention, rendered in a way necessary by the suppression of the *sedile* in those pictures. The feet were nailed either the one above the other by means of a single nail, which would explain the epithet *τρίσηλος*, *three-nailed*, given to the cross by Nonnus, in his versified paraphrase of John's Gospel (4th century), or the one beside the other, which generally demanded four nails in all, as Plautus † seems to say, but might also be executed with three, if we suppose the use of a nail in the form of a horseshoe having two points. Was the sole of the foot supported on the wood by means of a very full bend of the knee, or was the leg in its whole length laid to the cross, so that the feet preserved their natural position? Such details probably varied at the caprice of the executioner. The crucified usually lived twelve hours, sometimes even till the second or third day. The fever which soon set in produced a burning thirst. The increasing inflammation of the wounds in the back, hands, and feet ; the congestion of the blood in the head, lungs, and heart ; the swelling of every vein, an indescribable oppression, racking pains in the head ; the stiffness of the limbs, caused by the unnatural position of the body—these all united to make the punishment, in the language of Cicero (in "Verr." v. 64), *crudelissimum teterrimumque supplicium.*

From the beginning Jesus had foreseen that such would be the end of His life. He had announced it to Nicodemus (John 3 : 14), to the Jews (12 : 32), and once and again to His disciples. It was the foresight of this which had caused His agony in Gethsemane. No kind of death was so fitted to strike the imagination. For this very reason, no other was so well fitted to realize the end which God proposed in the death of Christ. The object was, as St. Paul says (Rom. 3), to give to the sinful world a complete demonstration (*ἔνδειξις*) of the righteousness of God (vers. 25, 26). By its cruelty, a death of this sort corresponds to the odiousness of sin ; by its duration, it leaves the crucified one time to recognize fully the right of God ; lastly, its dramatic character produces an impression, never to be effaced, on the conscience of the spectator. Of all known punishments, it was the cross which must be that of the Lamb of God.

We divide this piece into three parts : the way to the cross (vers. 26–32) ; the crucifixion (vers. 33–38) ; the time passed on the cross (39–46).

1*st.* Vers. 26–32.‡ The punishment required to be inflicted outside the city (Lev.

* Socrates, "Hist. Eccl." i. 17. † "Mostell." 2 : 1. 13.

‡ Ver. 26. ℵ. B. C. D. L. X. some Mnn., *Σίμωνα τινα κυρηναιον ερχομενον* instead of *Σίμωνος τινος κυρηναιου ερχομενου*. Ver. 27. A. B. C. D. L. X. some Mnn. omit *και* after *αι*. ℵ. omits *αι και*. Ver. 29. ℵ. B. C. L. *εθρεψαν*, D. *εξεθρεψαν*, instead of *εθηλασαν*. Ver. 31. D. K. A. several Mnn. It^{plerique}, Vg., *γενησεται* instead of *γενηται*.

24 : 14) ; it was the type of exclusion from human society (Heb. 13). John 19 : 17 informs us that Jesus went out of the city bearing His cross Himself, according to custom (Matt. 18 : 38). But we are left in ignorance of the motive which soon led the Roman soldiers charged with the execution to lay hold of Simon of Cyrene for this office. Did Jesus faint under the burden, or did Simon testify his sympathy with Him rather too loudly ; or was there here one of those abuses of military power which are readily indulged in the case of a foreigner ? We cannot tell. *Cyrene*, the capital of Libya, had a numerous Jewish population, many of whom came to settle at Jerusalem (Acts 6 : 9). It is natural to conclude from the words, *coming out of the country*, that he was returning to the city after his work. It was not therefore a holy day. Langen answers, it is true, that he might merely have been taking a walk ! Mark 15 : 21 proves that this event became a bond of union between Simon and the Saviour, and that he soon entered into the Church with his family. He afterward settled at Rome with his wife and two sons (Rom. 16 : 13).*

Vers. 27–32 are peculiar to Luke. In ver. 27 we see popular feeling breaking out through the mouth of the women, not, as M. de Pressensé thinks, those who had accompanied Jesus from Galilee, but inhabitants of Jerusalem. The sayings of Jesus testify to His entire self-forgetfulness ; they contain an allusion to Hos. 10 : 8. The meaning of ver. 31 appears to be that indicated by Bleek : the green wood is Jesus led to death as a rebel, notwithstanding His constant submission to the Gentile authorities ; the dry wood is the Jewish people, who, by their spirit of revolt, will, with much stronger reason, bring down on themselves the sword of the Romans. The more contrary to nature it is that Jesus should die as a rebel, the more is it in keeping with the nature of things that Israel should perish for rebellion. Thus Jesus makes the people aware of the falsehood which ruled His condemnation, and the way in which God will take vengeance. No doubt, behind the human judgment which visits the nation, there is found, as in all similar sayings (comp. Luke 3 : 9, etc.), the divine judgment reserved for each individual. This last reference is demanded by the connection of vers. 30 and 31.† The figure of the green wood and the dry is borrowed from Ezek. 21 : 3–8. The two malefactors were probably companions of Barabbas. This accumulation of infamy on Jesus was owing perhaps to the hatred of the rulers. God brought out of it the glory of His Son.

2d. Vers. 33–38.‡ Is the spot where Jesus was crucified that which is shown for

* This statement is a little stronger than the facts warrant, though early tradition sustains it. "Alexander and Rufus" are named by Mark as known to his readers, and it is assumed that this is the Rufus of Rom. 16 : 13. But Rufus was a common name, and his mother only is referred to. Tradition in the third and fourth centuries always found prominent places for names mentioned in the sacred writings.—J. H.

† The Dutch philologist Peerlkaamp (in his "Taciti Agricola," Leyden, 1864) thinks that we must transpose ver. 31, putting it after ver. 27 : "And they lamented Him, saying : If they do these things," etc. But this arbitrary transposition is not demanded by anything in the text.

‡ Ver. 33. 5 Mjj. 5 Mnn. Syr. It. Vg., *ηλθον* instead of *απηλθον*. Ver. 34. ℵ^{a} B. D. 2 Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ omit the words *ο δε Ιησους . . . ποιουσιν*. These words are found in 20 Mjj. the most of the Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique}, Ir. Hom. Clement, Acta Pilati, etc. A. X. several Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ Vg., *κληρους* instead of *κληρον* (which seems to be taken from the parallels of the LXX.). Ver. 35. 7 Mjj. 6 Mnn. Vss. omit *συν αυτοις* after *οι αρχοντες*. Ver. 36. ℵ. B. L., *ενεπαιξαν* instead of *ενεπαιζον*. ℵ. A. B. C. L. omit *και* before *οξος*. Ver. 38. ℵ. B. L. omit *γεγραμμενη*. ℵ^{ca} B. C. L. Syr^{cur}. omit the words *γραμμασιν ελληνικοις και ρωμαικοις και εβραικοις* (taken from John).

it at the present day, in the inclosure of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre? The question does not seem yet decided. Though this place is now within the city inclosure, it might not have been so then. The name *place of the skull* (skull, in Hebrew גלגלת, in Aramaic גלגלתא,* from גלל *to roll*) does not come from the skulls of the condemned which remained lying there; this would require the plural: the place of skulls; besides, unburied bones would not have been left there. The name is rather to be traced to the bare rounded form of the hill. Matthew and Mark relate here that Jesus refused the stupefying draught which was offered Him. According to Mark, it was aromatic wine; according to Matthew, vinegar mingled with gall.†

Of the seven sayings which Jesus uttered on the cross, the first three refer to the persons surrounding Him—His enemies, His companion in punishment, and those whom He loves most tenderly, His mother and His friend; they are, as it were, His will. The three which follow: "My God, my God . . . I thirst; it is finished," refer to His sufferings and the work which is being finished; the first two, to the sufferings of His soul and of His body; the third, to the result gained by this complete sacrifice. Finally, the seventh and last: "Father, into Thy hands . . ." is the cry of perfect confidence from His expiring heart in its utmost weakness. Three of those seven sayings, all three words of grace and faith, are related by Luke, and by him only.

The prayer of ver. 34 is wanting in some MSS. This omission is probably the result of accident; for the oldest translations, as well as the great majority of MSS., guarantee its authenticity; and the appeal of the thief for the grace of Jesus, a few moments later, cannot be well explained, except by the impression produced on him by the hearing of this filial invocation. The persons for whom this prayer is offered cannot be the Roman soldiers, who are blindly executing the orders which they have received; it is certainly the Jews, who, by rejecting and slaying their Messiah, are smiting themselves with a mortal blow (John 2 : 19). It is therefore literally true, that in acting thus *they know not what they do*. The prayer of Jesus was granted in the forty years' respite during which they were permitted, before perishing, to hear the apostolic preaching. The wrath of God might have been discharged upon them at the very moment.

The casting of the lot for the garments of Jesus (ver. 34) belongs to the same class of derisive actions as those related ver. 35 *et seq.* By this act the prisoner became the sport of his executioners. The garment of the *cruciarii* belonged to them, according to the Roman law. Every cross was kept by a detachment of four soldiers, a τετράδιον (Acts 12 : 4). The plural κλήρους, *lots*, is taken from the parallels. The lot was twice drawn, first for the division of the four nearly equal parts into which the garments of Jesus were divided (cloak, cap, girdle, sandals), then for His robe or tunic, which was too valuable to be put into one of the four lots. The word θεωρεῖν, *beholding* (ver. 35), does not seem to indicate a malevolent feeling; it rather forms a contrast with what follows. The words σὺν αὐτοῖς, *with them*, must be rejected from the text. The meaning of the term, *the chosen of God*, is, that the Christ is He on whose election rests that of the entire people. The mockeries of the soldiers apply to

* It is from this word that the name Golgotha is generally derived (Matthew, Mark, John). Kraft ("Topogr. Jerus." p. 158) has recently proposed another etymology: גל, *hill*, and גועת, *death* (comp. the place named Jer. 31 : 39).

† The ancient naturalists, Dioscorides and Galen, ascribe to incense and myrrh a stupefying influence (Langen, p. 302).

Jewish royalty in itself, more than to Jesus personally (John 19 : 5, 14, 15). It has often been thought that the wine which the soldiers offered to Jesus was that which had been prepared for themselves (ὄξος, a common wine); but the sponge and the rod of hyssop which are on the spot leave no doubt that it was intended to allay the sufferings of the prisoners. It was perhaps the same draught which had been offered to them at the beginning of the crucifixion. The soldiers pretend to treat Jesus as a king, to whom the festive cup is presented. Thus this derisive homage is connected with the ironical inscription (not in regard to Jesus, but in regard to the people) placed on the cross (ver. 38). It is this connection of ideas which is expressed by the ἦν δὲ καί, *there also was*. By this inscription, so humbling to the Jews, Pilate took vengeance for the degrading constraint to which they had subjected him by forcing him to execute an innocent man. The mention of the three languages is an interpolation taken from John.

3d. Vers. 39–46.* Matthew and Mark ascribe the same jestings to the *two* thieves. The partisans of harmony at any price think that they both began with blasphemy, and that one of them afterward came to himself. In any case, it must be assumed that Matthew and Mark did not know this change of mind; otherwise, why should they not have mentioned it? But is it not more natural to hold that they group in categories, and that they are ignorant of the particular fact related by Luke? How had this thief been touched and convinced? Undoubtedly he had been struck all at once with the contrast between the holiness which shone in Jesus and his own crimes (vers. 40 and 41). Then the meekness with which Jesus let Himself be led to punishment, and especially His prayer for His executioners, had taken hold of his conscience and heart. The title *Father*, which Jesus gave to God at the very moment when God was treating Him in so cruel a manner, had revealed in Him a Being who was living in an intimate relation to Jehovah, and led him to feel His divine greatness. His faith in the title King of the Jews, inscribed on His cross, was only the consequence of such impressions. The words οὐδὲ σύ, *not even thou* (ver. 40), which he addresses to his companion, allude to the difference of moral situation which belongs to them both, and the railers with whom he is joining: "Thou who are not merely, like them, a spectator of this punishment, but who art undergoing it thyself." It is not for him, who is on the eve of appearing before the divine tribunal, to act as the profane. Ὅτι, *because*, refers to the idea contained in φοβῇ: "Thou at least oughtest to fear . . . ; for . . ."

The prayer which he addresses to Jesus (ver. 42) is suggested to him by that faith in an unlimited mercy which had been awaked in him by hearing the prayer of Jesus for His executioners. It seems to me probable that the omission of the word Κύριε, *Lord*, in the Alex., arises from the mistake of the copyist, who was giving the prayer of the thief from memory, and that the transformation of the dative τῷ Ἰησοῦ into

* Ver. 39. B. L. *ουχι*, ℵ. C. Syr$^{cur.}$ It$^{aliq.}$ *λεγων ουχι*, instead of *λεγων ει*. Ver. 40. ℵ. B. C. L. X., *επιτιμων αυτω εφη* instead of *επετιμα αυτω λεγων*. Ver. 42. ℵ. B. C. L., *Ιησου* (vocative) instead of *τω Ιησου*. ℵ. B. C. D. L. M. 3 Mnn. omit *κυριε*. B. L. It$^{aliq.}$, *εις την βασιλειαν σου* instead of *εν τη βασιλεια σου*. Ver. 44. B. C. L. add *ηδη* before *ωσει*. Ver. 45. ℵ. B. C. (?) L., *του ηλιου εκλιποντος* instead of *και εσκοτισθη ο ηλιος*, which T. R. reads, with 17 Mjj. the most of the Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique}. ℵ. B. C. L., *εσχισθη δε* instead of *και εσχισθη*. Ver. 46. ℵ. A. B. C. K. M. P. Q. U. X. Π. 20 Mnn. Just. Or., *παρατιθεμαι* instead of *παραθησομαι*, which T. R. reads, with 8 Mjj. several Mnn. ℵ. B. C. D., *τουτο δε* instead of *και ταυτα*, which T. R. reads, with 12 Mjj., or *και τουτο*, which K. M. P. Π. 10 Mnn. It^{aliq} read.

the apostrophe (Ἰησοῦ) was the effect of this omission. The touching cry, *Remember me!* finds its explanation in that community of suffering which seems to him henceforth to establish an indissoluble bond between Jesus and him. Jesus cannot forget him who shared His punishment. The expression, *coming in His kingdom*, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ (not *for* His kingdom, εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν), denotes His Messianic return with divine splendor and royal majesty some time after His death. He does not think of the possibility of the *body* of Jesus being raised. In our Lord's answer, the word *to day* stands foremost, because Jesus wishes to contrast the nearness of the promised happiness with the remote future to which the prayer of the thief refers. *To-day*, before the setting of the sun which is shining on us. The word *paradise* seems to come from a Persian word signifying *park*. It is used in the form of פַּרְדֵּס (Eccles. 2 : 5 ; Song of Solomon, 4 : 13), to denote a royal garden. In the form παράδεισος, it corresponds in the LXX. to the word גַּן, *garden* (Gen. 2 : 8, 3 : 1). The earthly Eden once lost, this word *paradise* is applied to that part of Hades where the faithful are assembled ; and even in the last writings of the N. T., the Epistles and the Apocalypse, to a yet higher abode, that of the Lord and glorified believers, the third heaven, 2 Cor. 12 : 4 ; Rev. 2 : 7. It is paradise as part of Hades which is spoken of here.

The extraordinary signs which accompanied the death of Jesus (vers. 44, 45)—the darkness, the rending of the veil of the temple, and according to Matthew, the earthquake and the opening of several graves, are explained by the profound connection existing, on the one side between Christ and humanity, on the other between humanity and nature. Christ is the soul of humanity, as humanity is the soul of the external world. We need not take the words, *over all the earth*, in an absolute sense. Comp. 21 : 23, where the expression ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, a weaker one it is true, evidently refers to the Holy Land only. The phenomenon in question here may and must have extended to the surrounding countries. The cause of this loss of light cannot have been an eclipse ; for this phenomenon is impossible at the time of full moon. It was perhaps connected with the earthquake with which it was accompanied ; or it may have resulted from an atmospheric or cosmical cause.* This diminution of the external light corresponded to the moral darkness which was felt by the heart of Jesus : *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* This moment, to which St. Paul alludes (Gal. 3 : 13 : "He was made a curse for us"), was that at which the Paschal lamb was slain in the temple. It is difficult to decide between the two readings ver. 45 : "And the sun was darkened" (T. R.) ; "And the sun failing." In any case, it is the cause of the phenomenon related ver. 44, mentioned too late. Luke omits the earthquake ; he had other sources

* Neander cites the fact ("Leben Jesu" p. 640) that Phlegon, author of a chronicle under the Emperor Adrian, speaks of an eclipse (?) of the sun as having taken place in the fourth year of the 202d Olympiad (785 A.U.C.), greater than all former eclipses, and that night came on at the sixth hour of the day, to such a degree that the stars were seen shining in the heavens. This date approximates to the probable year of the death of Jesus (783). M. Liais, a well known naturalist, relates that on the 11th of April, 1860, in the province of Pernambuco, while the sky was perfectly clear, the sun became suddenly dark about midday to such a degree that for some seconds it was possible to look at it. The solar disk appeared surrounded with a ring having the colors of the rainbow, and quite near it there was seen a bright star, which must have been Venus. The phenomenon lasted for some minutes. M. Liais attributes it to cosmical nebulæ floating in space beyond our atmosphere. A similar phenomenon must have occurred in the years 1106, 1208, 1547, and 1706 ("Revue germanique," 1860).

The rending of the veil, mentioned by the three Syn., should probably be connected with this physical commotion. Is the veil referred to that which was at the entrance of the Holy Place, or that which concealed the Holy of Holies? As the second only had a typical sense, and alone bore, strictly speaking, the name καταπέτασμα (Philo calls the other κάλυμμα *), it is more natural to think of the latter. The idea usually found in this symbolic event is this: The way to the throne of grace is henceforth open to all. But did not God rather mean to show thereby, that from that time the temple was no longer His dwelling-place? As the high priest rent his garment in view of any great offence, so God rends the veil which covers the place where He enters into communion with His people; that is to say, the Holy of Holies is no more; and if there is no Holy of Holies, then no Holy Place, and consequently no court, no altar, no valid sacrifices. The temple is profaned, and consequently abolished by God Himself. The efficacy of sacrifice has henceforth passed to another blood, another altar, another priesthood. This is what Jesus had announced to the Jews in this form: Put me to death, and by the very deed ye shall destroy the temple! Jewish and Christian tradition has preserved the memory of analogous events which must have happened at this period. In the Judeo-Christian Gospel quoted by Jerome (in Matt. 27 : 51), it was related that at the time of the earthquake a large beam lying above the gate of the temple snapped asunder. The Talmud says that forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem the gates of the temple opened of their own accord. Johanan Ben Zacchai (יוחנן is חנן, *Anna*, with the name of *Jehovah* prefixed) rebuked them, and said: Temple, wherefore dost thou open of thyself? I see thereby that the end is near; for it is written (Zech. 11 : 1), "Open thy doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may devour thy cedars." † At the time of the eclipse mentioned above, a great earthquake destroyed part of the city of Nice, in Bithynia.‡ This catastrophe may have been felt even in Palestine. Those phenomena, which are placed by Luke before the time of our Lord's death, are placed by Matthew and Mark immediately after. Another proof of the difference of their sources.

Here should come the two sayings mentioned by John: *I thirst*, and *It is finished.* Perhaps the words: *When He had cried with a loud voice* (ver. 46), include the saying, *It is finished*, which immediately preceded the last breath. But the participle φωνήσας has probably no other meaning than the verb εἶπε: "Raising His voice He said." The words: *When He had cried with a loud voice*, in Matthew and Mark, refer rather to the last saying uttered by Jesus according to Luke: *Father, into thy hands . . .* The latter expresses what John has described in the form of an act: *He gave up His spirit.* The last saying is a quotation from Ps. 31. The fut. παραθήσομαι, *I shall commit*, in the received reading, is probably borrowed from the LXX. The fut. was natural in David's mouth, for death was yet at a distance; he described the way in which he hoped one day to draw his last breath. But the present is alone in keeping with the actual circumstances of Jesus. At the moment when He is about to lose self-consciousness, and when the possession of His spirit escapes from Him, He confides it as a deposit to his Father. The word *Father* shows that His soul has recovered full serenity. Not long ago He was struggling with the divine sovereignty and holiness (*my God, my God!*). Now the darkness is gone; He has recovered His light, His Father's face. It is the first effect of the completion of redemption, the glorious prelude of the resurrection.

* Neander, "Leben Jesu," p. 640.

† "Bab. Toma," 39. 2.

‡ See Neander's "Leben Jesu," p. 640.

Keim does not accept as historical any of the seven sayings which Jesus is said to have uttered on the cross. The prayer for his executioners has no meaning either in regard to the Gentile soldiers, who were merely blind instruments, or in respect of the Jews, to whom He had just announced divine judgment. Besides, silence suits Jesus better than a forced and superhuman heroism. The story of the thief is exploded by the fact that it was impossible for him to have known the innocence and the future return of Jesus, and that Jesus should have promised him paradise, which is in the hand of the Father. The saying addressed to John and Mary is not historical; for those two were not at the foot of the cross (Syn.), and John never had a house to which to take Mary. The prayer: *My God, my God*, is only an importation of Ps. 22 into the account of the Passion; Jesus was too original to borrow the expression of His feelings from the O. T. The same reason disproves the authenticity of the last saying: *Father, into Thy hands*, borrowed from Ps. 31. The *It is finished* of John is only the summary expression of the dogmatics already put by the author into the mouth of Jesus in His last discourses. The historic truth is thus reduced to two cries of Jesus: one of pain, which John has translated, not without reason, into *I thirst;* and a last cry, that of death. This silence of Jesus forms, according to Keim, the real greatness of His death. The prayer of Jesus and His threatening are not more contradictory than divine justice and human intercession. There is room in history for the effects of both. The prophetic form in which Jesus clothes the expression of His thoughts takes nothing from their originality. They spring from the depths of His being, and meet with expressions which are familiar to Him, and which He employs instinctively. John here, as throughout his Gospel, completes the synoptics. We think we have shown how the prayer of the thief is psychologically possible. It is doing too much honor to the primitive Church to ascribe to her the invention of such sayings. If she had invented, she would not have done so in a style so chaste, so concise, so holy; once more compare the apocryphal accounts.

THIRD CYCLE.—CHAP. 23: 47–56.

Close of the Account of the Passion.

Vers. 47–49.* These verses describe the immediate effects of our Lord's death, first on the Roman centurion (ver. 47), then on the people (ver. 48), lastly on the followers of Jesus (ver. 49). Mark says of the centurion: *When he saw.* These words relate to the last cry of Jesus and to the event of His death. In Matthew and Luke this same expression refers to all the events which had just passed. Luke gives the saying of this Gentile in the simplest form: *This was a righteous man;* that is to say: He was no malefactor, as was supposed. But this homage implied something more: for Jesus having given Himself out to be the Son of God, if He was a righteous man, must be more than that. Such is the meaning of the centurion's exclamation in the narratives of Matthew and Mark. Twice on the cross Jesus had called God *His Father;* the centurion could therefore well express himself thus: He was really, as He alleged, the Son of God! As the centurion's exclamation is an anticipation of the conversion of the Gentile world, so the consternation which takes possession of the Jews on witnessing the scene (ver. 48) anticipates the final penitence and conversion of this people (comp. Zech. 12: 10-14.) The word θεωρια, *that sight*, alludes to the feeling of curiosity which had attracted the multitude.

Among the acquaintance of Jesus spoken of ver. 49 there must have been some of His apostles. This is the necessary inference from the word πάντες, *all*. Μακρόθεν,

* Ver. 47. ℵ. B. D. L. R., εδοξαζεν instead of εδοξασεν. Ver. 48. 7 Mjj. Syr., θεωρησαντες instead of θεωρουντες. ℵ. A. B. C. D. L. some Mnn. omit εαυτων. Ver. 49. A. B. L. P. 2 Mnn., αυτω instead of αυτου after γνωστοι. ℵ. B. D. L. 10 Mnn. add απο before μακροθεν.

afar off, discovers the fear which prevailed among them. John and Mary had come nearer the cross (John 19 : 26, 27). Luke does not name till later any of the women present. Matthew and Mark here designate Mary Magdalene, of whom John also speaks ; Mary the mother of James and Joses, probably the same whom John calls Mary the wife of Cleopas, and aunt of Jesus ; with the mother of the sons of Zebedee, whom Mark calls Salome, and whom John leaves unmentioned, as he does when members of his own family are in question. The Syn. do not speak of the mother of Jesus. We ought probably to take in its literal sense the words : "From that hour that disciple took her unto his own home" (John 19 . 27). The heart of Mary was broken on hearing the deeply tender words which Jesus had spoken to her, and she withdrew that same hour, so that she was not present at the end of the crucifixion, when the friends of Jesus and the other women came near. Εἱστήκεισαν, *they stood*, is opposed to ὑπέστρεφον, *they returned* (ver. 48). While the people were leaving the cross, His friends assembled in sight of Jesus. The words : *beholding these things*, refer not only to the circumstances attending the death of Jesus, but also, and above all, to the departure of the terrified multitude. This minute particular, taken from the immediate impression of the witnesses, betrays a source in close connection with the fact.

Vers. 50–54.* *The Burial of Jesus.*—According to John, the Jewish authorities requested Pilate to have the bodies removed before the beginning of the next day, which was a Sabbath of extraordinary solemnity. For though Jesus and his companions in punishment were not yet dead, and though the law Deut. 21 : 22 did not here apply literally, they might have died before the end of the day which was about to begin, and the day be polluted thereby all the more, because, it being a Sabbath, the bodies could not be removed. The *crucifragium*, ordered by Pilate, was not meant to put the condemned immediately to death, but only to make it certain, which allowed of their being taken from the cross. Thus is explained the wonder of Pilate, when Joseph of Arimathea informed him that Jesus was already dead (Mark 15 : 44). The secret friends of our Lord show themselves at the time of His deepest dishonor. Already the word finds fulfilment (2 Cor. 5 : 14) : "The love of Christ constraineth us." Each evangelist characterizes Joseph in his own way. Luke : a counsellor good and just ; he is the καλὸς κἀγαθός, the Greek ideal. Mark : an honorable counsellor ; the Roman ideal. Matthew : a rich man ; is this not the Jewish ideal? Luke, moreover, brings out the fact, that Joseph had not agreed to the sentence (βουλῇ), nor to the odious plan (πράξει) by which Pilate's consent had been extorted. Ἀριμαθαία is the Greek form of the name of the town *Ramathaim* (1 Sam. 1 : 1), Samuel's birthplace, situated in Mount Ephraim, and consequently beyond the natural limits of Judea. But since the time spoken of in 1 Macc. 11 : 34, it had been reckoned to this province ; hence the expression : *a city of the Jews*. As to Joseph, he lived at Jerusalem ; for he had a sepulchre there. The received reading ὃς καὶ προσεδέχετο καὶ αὐτός, *who also himself waited*, is probably the

* Ver. 51. ℵ. B. C. D. L. It$^{aliq.}$, ος προσεδεχετο instead of ος και προσεδεχετο (T. some Mnn. Syr.) ; instead of ος και αυτος προσεδεχετο (6 Mjj. 15 Mnn) ; instead of ος και προσεδεχετο και αυτος (T. R., with 9 Mjj.) ; instead of ος προσεδεχετο και αυτος (several Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ Vg.). Ver. 53. ℵ. B. C. D. L. some Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ Vg. omit αυτο after καθελων. ℵ. B. C. D. It^{plerique}, Vg., αυτον instead of αυτο. ℵ. B. D. L. 3 Mnn., ουπω instead of ουδεπω Ver. 54. ℵ. B. C. L. 2 Mnn. It^{plerique}, Vg., παρασκευης instead of παρασκευη. 16 Mjj the most of the Mnn. omit κ͂ι before σαββατον, which is read by ℵ. B. C. L. some Mnn. Syr. It^{plerique}, Vg.

true one; it has been variously modified, because the relation of the *also himself* to the other friends of Jesus who were previously mentioned (ver. 49) was not understood; by the double καί, Luke gives prominence to the believing character of Joseph, even when no one suspected it.

Mark (15 : 46) informs us that the shroud in which the body was wrapped was bought at the same time by Joseph. How could such a purchase be made if the day was Sabbatic, if it was the 15th Nisan? Langen answers that Ex. 12 : 16 made a difference, so far as the preparation of food was concerned, between the 15th Nisan and the Sabbath properly so called, and that this difference might have extended to other matters, to purchases for example; that, besides, it was not necessary to pay on the same day. But the Talmud reverses this supposition. It expressly stipulates that when the 14th Nisan fell on the Sabbath day, it was lawful on that day to make preparation for the morrow, the 15th ("Mischna Pesachim," iii. 6 *et al.*), thus sacrificing the sacredness of the Sabbath to that of the feast day. Could the latter have been less holy! There is no ground for alleging that the authorization of Ex. 12 extended beyond the strict limits of the text.

According to the Syn., the circumstance which determined the use of this sepulchre was, that it belonged to Joseph. According to John, it was its nearness to the place of punishment, taken in connection with the approach of the Sabbath. But those two circumstances are so far from being in contradiction, that the one apart from the other would have no value. What influence could the approach of the Sabbath have had in the choice of this rocky sepulchre, if it had not belonged to one of the friends of Jesus? The Syn. do not speak of the part taken by Nicodemus in the burial of Jesus This particular, omitted by tradition, has been restored by John. It is of no consequence whether we read in ver. 54, παρασκευῆς or παρασκευή. The important point is, whether this name, which means *preparation*, denotes here the eve of the weekly Sabbath (Friday), or that of the Passover day (the 14th Nisan). Those who allege that Jesus was crucified on the 15th take it in the first sense; those who hold it to have been on the 14th, in the second. The text in itself admits of both views. But in the context, how can it be held, we would ask with Caspari (p. 172), that the holiest day of the feast of the year, the 15th Nisan, was here designated, like any ordinary Friday, the preparation for the Sabbath? No doubt Mark, in the parall., translates this word by προσάββατον, *day before Sabbath* (15 : 42). But this expression may mean in a general way: the eve of Sabbath or of any Sabbatic day whatever. And in the present case it must have this latter sense, as appears from the ἐπεί, *because*. Mark means to explain, by the Sabbatic character of the following day, why they made haste to bury the body: it was the pro-Sabbath. What meaning would this reason have had, if the very day on which they were acting had been a Sabbatic day? Matt. 27 : 62 offers an analogous expression. In speaking of Saturday, the morrow after the death of Jesus, Matthew says: 'the next day, that followed the preparation." We have already called attention to this expression ("Comment. sur Jean," t. ii. p. 638). "If this Saturday," says Caspari (p. 77), "had been an ordinary Sabbath, Matthew would not have designated it in so strange a manner. The preparation in question must have had a character quite different from the preparation for the ordinary Sabbath. This preparation day must have been so called as a day of special preparation, as itself a feast day; it must have been the 14th Nisan." The term ἐπέφωσκε, *was beginning to shine*, is figurative. It is taken from the natural day, and applied here to the civil day.

Vers. 55, 56.* The embalming of Jesus having been done in haste, the women proposed to complete it. This same evening, therefore, they prepared the odoriferous herbs (ἀρώματα) and the perfumed oils (μύρα) necessary for the purpose ; and the hour of the Sabbath being come, they rested. Once more, what would be the meaning of this conduct if that very day had been Sabbatic, the 15th Nisan ? Evidently it was yet the 14th ; and the 15th, which was about to begin, was at once the weekly Sabbath and the first Passover day, and so invested with double sacredness, as John remarks (19 : 31). Mark says, somewhat differently (16 : 1), that they made their preparations *when the Sabbath was past*, that is to say, on the morrow in the evening. No doubt they had not been able to finish them completely on the Friday before six o'clock afternoon. The καί of the T. R. before γυναῖκες, ver. 55, is evidently a corruption of αἱ. It has been asked how, if Jesus predicted His resurrection, the women could have prepared to embalm His body. But we have seen the answer in the case of the converted thief : they expected a glorious reappearance of Jesus from heaven after His death, but not the reviving of His body laid in the tomb. A feeling of pious and humble fidelity is expressed in the conduct of the women, as it is described by Luke in the touching words : " And they rested according to the commandment." It was the last Sabbath of the old covenant. It was scrupulously respected.

Conclusion regarding the Day of Jesus' Death.

It follows from the exegesis of chaps. 22 and 23, that according to the Syn., as well as according to John, the day of Jesus' death was not the first and great day of the paschal feast (15th Nisan), but the day before (or *preparation*), the 14th Nisan, which that year was a Friday, and so, at the same time, the *preparation* for the Sabbath. Hence it follows also that the last feast of Jesus took place on the evening between the 13th and 14th, and not on the evening between the 14th and 15th, when the whole people celebrated the paschal feast. Such is the result to which we are brought by all the passages examined : 22 : 7-9, 10–15, 66 ; 23 : 26, 53, 54, 55, 56 ; Matt. 26 : 5, 18 ; 27 : 62 ; Mark 14 : 2 ; 15 : 42, 46 ; so that, on the main question, it appears to us that exegetically there can be no doubt, seeing that our four Gospel accounts present no real disagreement. The fact, therefore, stands as follows : On the 13th, toward evening, Jesus sent the two disciples most worthy of His confidence to prepare the paschal feast ; in the opinion of all the rest, this was with a view to the following evening, when the national feast was to be celebrated. But Jesus knew that by that time the hour would be past for His celebrating this last Passover. This same evening, therefore, some hours after having sent the two disciples, He seated Himself at the table prepared by them and by the master of the house. There was in this a surprise for the apostles, which is probably referred to by Luke 22 : 15 : " With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer." Above all, it was a surprise to Judas, who had resolved to give Him up this same evening. This anticipation on the part of Jesus, the Lord of the Sabbath and of the whole law (6 : 5), involved nothing less than the abrogation of the paschal feast and of the ancient covenant.

This exegetical result agrees fully with Jewish tradition. In " Bab. Sanhedr." 43. 1, it is expressly said (Caspari, p. 156) : " Jesus was executed on the eve of the Passover. A public crier had proclaimed for seventy days that a man was to be stoned for having bewitched Israel and seduced it into schism ; that he who had anything to say for his justification should present himself and testify for him ; but no one appeared to justify him. Then they crucified him on *the evening* [the eve] *of the Passover* (בערב פסח)." This last expression can denote nothing but the evening

* Ver. 55. Instead of δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες, which T. R. reads, with some Mnn., the Mjj. read either δὲ γυναῖκες or δὲ αἱ γυναῖκες.

preceding the Passover, as ערב השבת, *evening of the Sabbath*, never denotes anything but Friday evening. This view seems also to be that which prevailed in the Church in the most ancient times, as we see from Clement of Alexandria, who lived when primitive tradition was not yet effaced, and who professes without hesitation the same opinion. It is, moreover, in keeping with the admirable symbolism which is the character of all God's works. Jesus dies on the afternoon of the 14th, at the very moment when the paschal lamb was slain in the temple. He rests in the tomb on the 15th Nisan, a day doubly Sabbatic that year, as being Saturday and the first day of the feast. This day of rest, so exceptionally solemn, divides the first creation, which is terminating, from the second, which is beginning. Jesus rises on the morrow, 16th Nisan, the very day on which there was offered in the temple the first sheaf cut in the year, the *first fruits* of the harvest. Is it not to this symbolism that St. Paul himself alludes in the two passages: "Christ, *our Passover*, is sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. 5 : 7); and, "Every one in his own order; Christ, *the first fruits*; afterward they that are His, at His coming" (1 Cor. 15 : 23)? It is probable, also, that if St. Paul had regarded the night on which Jesus instituted the Holy Supper as the same on which Israel celebrated the Passover, he would not have designated it simply (1 Cor. 11 : 23) as that *on which our Lord was betrayed.*

The only further question which may yet appear doubtful, is whether the compilers of our three synoptic narratives had a clear view of the real course of events. They have faithfully preserved to us the facts and sayings which help us to make it out; but is there not some confusion in their minds? Was not this last feast of Christ, which had all the features of an ordinary paschal feast, and in which He had instituted the supper as the counterpart of the Israelitish rite, confounded in the traditional accounts with the national paschal feast? And has not this confusion exercised a certain influence on the account of the Syn.? This, at least, is the difference which exists between them and John: they relate simply, without concerning themselves about the difference between this last supper and the Israelitish paschal feast; while John, who sees this confusion gaining ground, expressly emphasizes the *distinction* between the two.*

As to the bearing of this question on the paschal controversy of the second century, and on the authenticity of the Gospel of John, it may be explained in two ways: Either the event celebrated by the Asiatics was, as is natural, *the death* of Christ (Steitz), and not the fact of *the institution of the Supper* (Baur), and hence it would follow, in entire harmony with the fourth Gospel, that they regarded the 14th, and not the 15th, as the day of the crucifixion (this is the explanation which we have advocated in the "Comment. sur Jean"); or it may be maintained, as is done by M. E. Schürer (whose dissertation on this question † leaves little to be desired), that the Asiatic rite was determined neither by the day on which the Holy Supper was instituted, nor even by that on which Christ died, but solely by the desire of keeping up in the churches of Asia, for the Holy Easter Supper, the day *on which the law ordained the paschal feast to be celebrated.* In this case, the Asiatic rite neither contradicted nor confirmed John's narrative; it had no connection with it.

From this determination of the day of the month on which Jesus died, it remains for us to draw a conclusion regarding the year of that event. The result obtained is, that in that year the 13th Nisan, the preparation for the Passover and the day of the crucifixion, fell on a Friday, and the day of the Passover, 14th Nisan, on a Saturday. Now, it follows from the calculations of Wurm (Bengel's "Archiv." 1816. ii.), and of Oudemann, Professor of Astronomy at Utrecht ("Revue de théol." 1863, p. 221), whose results differ only by a few minutes, that in the years from 28 to 36 of our era, in one of which the death of Jesus must have fallen, the day of the Passover, 15th Nisan, was a Saturday only in 30 and 34 (783 and 787 A.U.C.).‡ If, then, Jesus was

* We have the satisfaction of finding ourselves at one in this view with Krummel in the *Litteraturblatt* of Darmstadt, February, 1868, with M. C. Baggesen ("Der Apostel Johannes, sein Leben und seine Schriften," 1869), and (in substance) with Caspari.

† "De controversiis paschalibus sec. post. Chr. n. seculo exortis," Leipzig, 1869.

‡ Sometimes Wurm's calculation is cited to an opposite effect. But it must not be forgotten that he dates, as we do, from midnight, instead of making the days begin

born (p. 126) at the end of 749 or the beginning of 750 A.U.C., 3–4 years before our era; if He was baptized in the course of His 30th year (Luke 3 : 23); if His ministry lasted about 2½ years (John); if, finally, His death took place, as all the evangelists attest, at the feast of Passover: this Passover must have been that of the year 30 of our era (783 A.U.C.). The result of astronomical calculation thus confirms the Gospel statements, especially those of John. And we can fix the date of Christ's death on Friday the 14th Nisan (7th April) of the year 30.*

as the Jews did, at sunset. This circumstance exercises a decisive influence in this case (Caspari, p. 16).

* Caspari places the baptism of Jesus as we do, in 28, and His death in 30. Keim: the beginning of His ministry, in the spring of 34; the death of John the Baptist, in the autumn of 34; the death of Jesus, at the Passover of 35. Hitzig: the death of Jesus, in 36

SEVENTH PART.

THE RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION.

Chap. 24.

It is in this part of the Gospel narrative that the four accounts diverge most. As friends, who for a time have travelled together, disperse at the end of the journey to take each the way which brings him to his own home, so in this last part, the peculiar object of each evangelist exercises an influence on his narrative yet more marked than before. Luke, who wishes to describe the *gradual growth* of Christian work from Nazareth to Rome, prepares, in those last statements of his Gospel, for the description of the apostolic preaching and of the founding of the Church, which he is about to trace in the Acts. Matthew, whose purpose is to prove the *Messianic claims* of Jesus, closes his demonstration by narrating the most solemn appearance of the risen Jesus, when He made known to the Church His elevation to universal sovereignty, and installed the apostles in their mission as conquerors of the world. John, who relates the history of the development of faith in the founders of the gospel, side by side with that of incredulity in Israel, closes his narrative with the appearance which led to the profession of Thomas, and which consummated the triumph of faith over unbelief in the apostolic circle. It is vain to mutilate the conclusion of Mark's work. We find here again the characteristic feature of his narrative. He had, above all, exhibited the powerful *activity of our Lord* as a divine evangelist: the last words of his account, 16 : 19, 20, show us Jesus glorified, still co-operating from heaven with His apostles.

Each evangelist knows well the point at which he aims, and hence the reason that the narratives diverge more as they reach the conclusion. The special differences in the accounts of the resurrection are partly the effect of this principal divergence. Of the four accounts, the two extremes are that of Matthew, which puts the whole stress on the great Galilean appearance, and that of Luke, which relates only the appearances in Judea. The other two are, as it were, middle terms. Mark (at least from 16 : 9) is dependent on the former two, and oscillates between them. John really unites them by relating, like Luke, the appearances at Jerusalem, while mentioning also, like Matthew, a remarkable appearance in Galilee. If, indeed, chap. 21 was not composed by John, it certainly proceeds from a tradition emanating from this apostle. The fact of appearances having taken place both in Judea and Galilee is also confirmed indirectly by Paul, as we shall see.

The account of Luke contains: 1. The visit of the women to the tomb (vers. 1–7). 2. Peter's visit to the tomb (vers. 8–12). 3. The appearance to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus (vers. 13–32). 4. The appearance to the disciples on the evening

of the resurrection day (vers. 33–43). 5. The last instructions of Jesus (vers. 44–49). 6. The ascension (vers. 50–53).

1. *The Women at the Sepulchre :* vers. 1–7.—Vers. 1–7.* The women play the first, if not the principal, part in all those accounts ; a special duty called them to the tomb. They were, according to Matt. 28 : 1, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary (the aunt of Jesus) ; according to Mark (16 : 1), those same two, and Salome the mother of James and John ; according to Luke (ver. 10), the first two, along with the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward (8 : 3). John names only Mary Magdalene. But does not Mary herself allude to the presence of others when she says (ver. 2) : "We know not where they have laid Him"? If John names her so specially, it is because he intends to give anew the account of the appearance which tradition had either omitted or generalized (Matthew), and which as, having taken place first, had a certain importance. As to the time of the women's arrival, Luke says, *Very early in the morning ;* Matthew, *ὀψὲ σαββάτων*, which signifies, not *Sabbath evening*, but (like the phrases *ὀψὲ μυστηρίων, peractis mysteriis, ὀψὲ τρωϊκῶν*, after the Trojan war ; see Bleek) : *after the Sabbath*, in the night which followed. By the *τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ*, Matthew expresses the fact that it was at the time of daybreak. Mark says, with a slight difference, which only proves the independence of his narrative (to ver. 8), *At the rising of the sun.* The object of the women was, according to Matthew, to visit the sepulchre ; according to the other two, to embalm the body.

The fact of the resurrection itself is not described by any evangelist, no one having been present. Only the *Risen One* was seen. It is of Him that the evangelists bear witness. Matthew is the one who goes furthest back. An earthquake, due to the action of an angel (*γάρ*), shakes and dislodges the stone ; the angel seats himself upon it, and the guards take to flight. Undoubtedly, it cannot be denied that this account, even in its style (the parallelism, ver. 3), has a poetic tinge. But some such *fact* is necessarily supposed by what follows. Otherwise, how would the sepulchre have been found open on the arrival of the women? It is at this point that the other accounts begin. In John, Mary Magdalene sees nothing except the stone which has been rolled away ; she runs instantly to apprise Peter and John. It may be supposed that the other women did not accompany her, and that, having come near the sepulchre, they were witnesses of the appearance of the angel ; then, that they returned home. Not till after that did Mary Magdalene come back with Peter and John (John 21 : 1–9). It might be supposed, indeed, that this whole account given by the Syn. regarding the appearance of the angel (Matthew and Mark), or of the two angels (Luke), to the women, is at bottom nothing more than the fact of the appearance of the angels to Mary related by John (20 : 11–13) and generalized by tradition. But vers. 22, 23 of Luke are not favorable to this view. Mary Magdalene, having seen the Lord immediately after the appearance of the angels, could not have related the first of those facts without also mentioning the second, which was far more important.

In the angel's address, as reproduced by the Syn., everything differs, with the

* The MSS. are divided between *βαθεος* (T. R., Byz.) and *βαθεως* (Alex.), and between *μνημα* (T. R.) and *μνημειον* (taken from the parall.). ℵ. B. C. L. 2 Mnn. It^{plerique}, Vg. omit the words *και τινες συν αυταις*. Ver. 4. ℵ. B. C. D. L., *απορεισθαι* instead of *διαπορεισθαι*. ℵ. B. D. It. Vg., *εν εσθητι αστραπτουση* instead of *εν εσθησεσιν αστραπτουσαις*. Ver. 5. The MSS. are divided between *το προσωπον* (T. R., Byz.) and *τα προσωπα* (Alex.).

single exception of the words which are identical in all, *He is not here.* A common document is inadmissible. In Luke, the angel recalls to the memory of the women former promises of a resurre tion. In Matthew and Mark, he reminds them, while calling on them to remind the disciples, of the rendezvous which Jesus had appointed for His own in Galilee before His death. Προάγει, *He goeth before*, like an invisible shepherd walking at the head of His visible flock. Already, indeed, before His death Jesus had shown His concern to reconstitute His Galilean Church, and that in Galilee itself (Mark 14 : 28 , Matt. 26 : 32) ; *ὑμᾶς you,* cannot apply to the apostles only to the exclusion of the women ; it embraces all the faithful. It is also certain that the last words, *There ye shall see Him,* do not belong to the sayings of Jesus which the women are charged to report to the disciples. It is the angel himself who speaks, as is proved by the expression, *Lo, I have told you* (Matthew) ; and more clearly still by the words, *As He said unto you* (Mark). This gathering, which Jesus had in view even in Gethsemane, at the moment when He saw them ready to be scattered, and which forms the subject of the angel's message immediately after the resurrection, was intended to be the general reunion of all the faithful, who for the most part were natives of Galilee, and who formed the nucleus of the future Church of Jesus. After that, we shall not be surprised to hear St. Paul speak (1 Cor. 15) of an assemblage of more than 500 brethren, of whom the 120 Galileans of Pentecost were the *élite* (Acts 1 : 15, 2 : 7) ; comp. also the expression *my brethren* (John 20 : 17), which certainly includes more than the eleven apostles. There follows in Matthew an appearance of Jesus to the women just as they are leaving the tomb. It seems to me that this appearance can be no other than that which, according to John, was granted to Mary Magdalene. Tradition had applied it to the women in general. Comp. the expressions, *They embraced His feet* (Matthew), with the words, *Touch me not*, in John ; *Tell my brethren* (Matthew), with *Go to my brethren and say unto them*, in John. Finally, it must be remarked that in the two accounts this appearance of Jesus immediately follows that of the angel. In Matthew's mind, does the promise, *There shall they see me*, exclude all appearance to the apostles previous to that which is here announced? If it is so, the contradiction between this declaration and the accounts of Luke and John is glaring. But even in Matthew, the expression, *There* [in Galilee] *ye shall see me*, ver. 7, is immediately followed by an appearance of Jesus to those women, and that *in Judea* (ver. 9) ; this fact proves clearly that we must not give such a negative force to Matthew's expression. What we have here is *the affirmation* of a solemn reunion which shall take place in Galilee, and at which not only the apostles, but the women and all the faithful, shall be present. That does not at all exclude special appearances granted to this or that one before the appearance here in question.

The following was therefore the course of events . Mary Magdalene comes to the sepulchre with other women. On seeing the stone rolled away, she runs to inform the disciples ; the other women remain ; perhaps others besides arrived a little later (Mark). The angel declares to them the resurrection, and they return. Mary Magdalene comes back with Peter and John ; then, having remained alone after their departure, she witnesses the first appearance of Jesus risen from the dead.

2. *Visit of Peter to the Sepulchre :* vers. 8–12.—Vers. 8–12.* As we have found the

* Ver. 10. 13 Mjj. 45 Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ omit *αι* before *ελεγον*. Ver. 11. ℵ. B. D. L. Syr. It^{plerique}, *τα ρηματα ταυτα* instead of *τα ρηματα αυτων*. Ver. 12. This verse is entirely omitted by D a b e l Fuld. Syr$^{hier.}$ It is found in 19 Mjj. all the Mnn. Syr$^{cur.}$ Syr$^{sch.}$ It$^{aliq.}$ Sah. Cop.

account given, John 20 : 14–18, in Matthew's narrative of the appearance to the women, so we recognize here the fact which is related more in detail in John 20 : 1–10. Luke says, ver. 9, that on returning from the sepulchre the women related what they had seen and heard, while, according to Mark (ver. 8), *they kept silence.* This contradiction is explained by the fact that the two sayings refer to two different events : the first, to the account which Mary Magdalene gives to Peter and John, and which led them to the sepulchre (Luke, vers. 12 and 22–24)—a report which soon spread among the apostles and all the disciples ; the other, to the first moments which followed the return of the other women, until, their fears having abated, they began to speak. But this contradiction in terms proves that at least up to ver. 8 Mark had not Luke before him. The *αἳ* of the T. R., ver. 10, before *ἔλεγον* is indispensable. The omission of ver. 12 in the Cantab. and some copies of the Latin and Syriac translations appeared so serious a matter to Tischendorf that he rejected this verse in his eighth edition. But if it were an interpolation taken from John, it would not have mentioned Peter only, but Peter and John (or *the other disciple*). And the apparent contradiction would have been avoided between this verse and ver. 24, where it is not *an* apostle, but *certain of them* (*τίνες*), who repair to the sepulchre. The extreme caprice and carelessness which prevail throughout cod. D and the documents of the Itala which are connected with it are well known. The entire body of the other Mjj. and of the Mnn., as well as most of the copies of the ancient translations, support the T. R. Some such historical fact as that mentioned in this verse is required by the declaration of the two disciples (ver. 24). There is, besides, a striking resemblance between the account of John and that of Luke. The terms *παρακύψας, ὀθονία κείμενα, πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀπελθεῖν*, are found in both.

3. *The Appearance on the way to Emmaus:* vers. 13–32.—Vers. 13–32.* Here is one of the most admirable pieces in Luke's Gospel. As John alone has preserved to us the account of the appearance to Mary Magdalene, so Luke alone has transmitted to us that of the appearance granted to the two disciples of Emmaus. The summary of this event in Mark (16 : 12, 13) is evidently nothing more than an extract from Luke.

Vers. 13–16. *The Historical Introduction.*—*Ἰδού, behold,* prepares us for something unexpected. One of the two disciples was called *Cleopas* (ver. 18). This name is an abbreviation of Cleopatros, and not, like *Κλωπᾶς* (John 19 : 25), the reproduction of the Hebrew name חַלְפִּי, which Luke always translates by *Ἀλφαῖος* (6 : 15 ; Acts 1 : 13). This name, of Greek origin, leads to the supposition that this disciple was a proselyte come to the feast. As to the other, it has been thought (Theophylact, Lange) that it was Luke himself—first, because he is not named ; and next, because of the peculiarly dramatic character of the narrative following (comp. especially ver. 32). Luke 1 : 2 proves nothing against this view. For the author distinguishes himself in this passage, not from witnesses absolutely, but from those who were witnesses from the beginning ; and this contact for a moment did not give him the right to rank himself among the authors of the Gospel tradition. Jesus, by manifesting

* Ver. 13. ℵ. I. K. N. Π. some Mnn., *εκατον εξηκοντα* instead of *εξηκοντα*. Ver. 17. ℵ. A. (?) B. Le., *και εσταθησαν σκυθρωποι* instead of *και εστε σκυθρωποι*. Ver. 18. ℵ. B. L. N. X., *ονοματι* instead of *ω ονομα*. All the Mjj., Λ. excepted, omit *εν* before *Ιερουσαλημ*. Ver. 19. ℵ. B. I. L., *ναζαρηνου* instead of *ναζωραιου*. Ver. 21. ℵ. D. B. L. add *και* after *αλλαγε*. ℵ. B. L. Syr. omit *σημερον*. Ver. 28 ℵ. A. B. D. L. It^{alt_q}., *προσεποιησατο* instead of *προσεποιειτο*. Ver. 29. ℵ. B. L. some Mnn. It^{ali_q}. Vg. add *ηδη* after *κεκλικεν*. Ver. 32. ℵ. B. D L. omit *και* before *ως διηνοιγεν*.

Himself to these two men, accomplished for the first time what He had announced to the Greeks, who asked to speak with Him in the temple: "If I be lifted up from the earth, I will draw all men unto me" (John 12 : 32, 33). Emmaus is not, as was held by Eusebius and Jerome, *Ammaus* (later Nicopolis), the modern *Anwas*, situated to the S.E. of Lydda; for this town lies 180 furlongs from Jerusalem, more than double the distance mentioned by Luke, and such a distance is incompatible with our account (ver. 23). Caspari (p. 207) has been led to the conviction previously expressed by Sepp, that this place is no other than the village *Ammaus* mentioned by Josephus (Bell. Jud. vii. 6. 6), which Titus assigned to 800 veterans of his army to found a colony. This place, stuated E.S.E. from Jerusalem, is called even at the present day *Kolonieh*, and is distant exactly 60 furlongs from Jerusalem. In Succa iv. 5, the Talmud says that there, at Maûza (with the article: Hama Maûza), they go to gather the green boughs for the feast of Tabernacles; elsewhere it is said that "Maûza is Kolonieh." The *reasoning*, *συζητεῖν* (ver. 15), bore, according to ver. 21, on the force of the promises of Jesus. The *ἐκρατοῦντο*, *were holden* (ver. 16), is explained by the concurrence of two factors: the incredulity of the disciples regarding the bodily resurrection of Jesus (comp. ver. 25), and a mysterious change which had been wrought on the person of our Lord (comp. Mark 16 : 12 : *ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ*, and John 20 : 15, *supposing Him to be the gardener* . . .).

Vers. 17–19*a*. *Beginning of the Conversation.*—Ver. 17. Jesus generally interrogates before instructing. As a good teacher, in order to be heard, He begins by causing his auditors to speak (John 1 : 38). The Alex. reading at the end of ver. 17, allowed by Tischendorf (8th ed.): *and stood sad*, borders on the absurd. Ver. 18. *Μόνος* belongs to both verbs, *παροικεῖς* and *οὐκ ἔγνως*, together. They take Jesus for one of those numerous strangers who, like themselves, are temporarily sojourning at Jerusalem. An inhabitant of the city would not have failed to know these things; and in their view, to know them was to be engrossed with them.

Vers. 19*b*–24. *Account of the Two Disciples.*—Jesus has now brought them to the point where He wished, namely, to open up their heart to Him; *σὺν πᾶσι τούτοις* (ver. 21), in spite of the extraordinary qualities described ver. 19. *Ἄγει* may be taken impersonally, as in Latin, *agit diem*, for *agitur dies*. But it may also have Jesus for its subject, as in the phrase *ἄγει δεκατὸν ἔτος*, "he is in his tenth year." But along with those causes of discouragement, there are also grounds of hope. This opposition is indicated by *ἀλλὰ καί*, "But indeed there are also . . ." (ver. 22). Ver. 23. *Λέγουσαι*, *οἱ λέγουσιν*, hearsay of a hearsay. This form shows how little faith they put in all those reports (comp. ver. 11). Ver. 24. Peter, then, was not the only one, as he seemed to be from ver. 12. Here is an example, among many others, of the traps which are unintentionally laid for criticism by the simple and artless style of our sacred historians. On each occasion they say simply what the context calls for, omitting everything which goes beyond, but sometimes, as here, adding it themselves later (John 3 : 22; comp. with 4 : 2). The last words, *Him they saw not*, prove that the two disciples set out from Jerusalem between the return of the women and that of Peter and John, and even of Mary Magdalene.

Vers. 25–27. *The Teaching of Jesus.*—The *καὶ αὐτός*, *then He* (ver. 25), shows that His turn has now come. They have said everything—they have opened their heart; now it is for Him to fill it with new things. And first, in the way of rebuke (ver. 25). *Ἀνοητοί*, *fools*, refers to the understanding; *βραδεῖς*, *slow*, to the heart. If they had embraced the living God with more fervent faith, the fact of the resur

rection would not have been so strange to their hopes (20 : 37, 38). Next, in the way of instruction (vers. 26 and 27). Ver. 26 is the central word of this narrative. The explanation of the *ἐδει, ought,* was no doubt rather exegetical than dogmatical; it turned on the text presented by the prophecies (ver. 27). Jesus had before Him a grand field, from the Protevangelium down to Mal. 4. In studying the Scriptures for Himself, He had found Himself in them everywhere (John 5 : 39, 40). He had now only to let this light which filled His heart ray forth from Him. The second *ἀπό* (ver. 27) shows that the demonstration began anew with every prophet.

Vers. 28–32. *Historical Conclusion.*—When Jesus *made* as if He would continue His journey, it was not a mere feint. He would have really gone, but for that sort of constraint which they exercised over Him. Every gift of God is an invitation to claim a greater (*χάριν αντὶ χάριτος,* John 1 : 16). But most men stop very quickly on this way : and thus they never reach the full blessing (2 Kings 13 : 14–19). The verb *κατακλιθῆναι, to sit down at table* (ver. 30), applies to a common meal, and does not involve the idea of a Holy Supper. Acting as head of the family, Jesus takes the bread and gives thanks. The word *διηνοίχθησαν, were opened* (ver. 31), is contrasted with the preceding, *were holden,* ver. 16. It indicates a divine operation, which destroys the effect of the causes referred to, ver. 16. No doubt the influence exercised on their heart by the preceding conversation and by the thanksgiving of Jesus, as well as the manner in which He broke and distributed the bread, had prepared them for this awaking of the inner sense. The sudden disappearance of Jesus has a supernatural character. His body was already in course of glorification, and obeyed more freely than before the will of the spirit. Besides, it must be remembered that Jesus, strictly speaking, *was* already *no more with them* (ver. 44), and that the miracle consisted rather in His appearing than in His disappearing. The saying, so intimate in its character, which is preserved ver. 32, in any case betrays a source close to the event itself; tradition would not have invented such a saying.

If we accept the view which recognizes Luke himself in the companion of Cleopas, we shall find ourselves brought to this critical result, that each evangelist has left in a corner of his narrative a modest indication of his person : Matthew, in the publican whom Jesus removes by a word from his previous occupations; Mark, in the young man who flees, leaving his garment at Gethsemane; John, in the disciple designated as he whom Jesus loved; Luke, in the anonymous traveller of Emmaus.

4. *The Appearance to the Apostles :* vers. 33–43.—Vers. 33–43.* The two travellers, immediately changing their intended route, return to Jerusalem, where they find the apostles assembled and full of joy. An appearance of Jesus to Peter had overcome all the doubts left by the accounts of the women. This appearance should probably be placed at the time when Peter returned home (ver. 12), after his visit to the tomb. Paul places it (1 Cor. 15) first of all. He omits Luke's first (the two going to Emmaus) and John's first (Mary Magdalene). For where apostolic testimony is in question as in that chapter, unofficial witnesses, not *chosen* (Acts 1 : 2), are left out of account. Peter was not at that time restored as an apostle (comp. John 21), but he received his

* Ver. 33. ℵ. B. D., *ηθροισμενους* instead of *συνηθροισμενους*. Ver. 36. D. It$^{aliq.}$ omit the words *και λεγει αυτοις ειρηνη υμιν*. Ver. 38. B. D. It^{plerique}, *εν τη καρδια* instead of *εν ταις καρδιαις*. Ver. 39. ℵ. D. Ir., *σαρκας* instead of *σαρκα*. Ver. 40. This verse is omitted by D. It$^{aliq.}$ Syr^{cur}. Ver. 42. ℵ. A. B. D. L. Π. Clement. Or. omit *και απο μελισσιου κηριου*, which is read by T. R. 12 Mjj. all the Mnn. Syr. It$^{aliq.}$ Justin, etc.

LIBRARY K. C. K.

pardon as a believer. If tradition had invented, would it not, above all, have imagined an appearance to John? This account refers to the same appearance as John 20 : 19–23. The two Gospels place it on the evening of the resurrection day. The sudden appearance of Jesus, ver. 36, indicated by the words, *He stood in the midst of them*, is evidently supernatural, like His disappearance (ver. 31). Its miraculous character is expressed still more precisely by John, *The doors were shut*. The salutation would be the same in both accounts: *Peace be unto you*, were we not obliged to give the preference here to the text of the *Cantab.* and of some copies of the *Itala*, which rejects these words. The T. R. has probably been interpolated from John. The term πνεῦμα (ver. 37) denotes *the spirit* of the dead returning without a body from Hades, and appearing in a visible form as *umbra*, φάντασμα (Matt. 14 : 26). This impression naturally arose from the sudden and miraculous appearance of Jesus. The διαλογισμοί, *inward disputings*, are contrasted with the simple acknowledgment of Him who stands before them. At ver. 39, Jesus asserts His identity: "That it is I myself," and then His corporeity: "Handle me, and see." The sight of His hands and feet proves those two propositions by the wounds, the marks of which they still bear. Ver. 40 is wanting in D. It^{aliq}. It might be suspected that it is taken from John 20 : 20, if in this latter passage, instead of *His feet*, there was not *His side*. In vers. 41–43, Jesus gives them a new proof of His corporeity by eating meats which they had to offer Him. Their very joy prevented them from believing in so great a happiness, and formed an obstacle to their faith. Strauss finds a contradiction between the act of eating and the notion of a glorified body. But the body of Jesus was in a transition state. Our Lord Himself says to Mary Magdalene, "I am not yet ascended . . . but I ascend" (John 20 : 17). On the one hand, then, He still had His terrestrial body. On the other, this body was already raised to a higher condition. We have no experience to help us in forming a clear idea of this transition, any more than of its goal, the glorified body. The omission of the words, *and of an honeycomb*, in the Alex., is probably due to the confusion of the καί which precedes with that which follows.

This appearance of Jesus in the midst of the apostles, related by John and Luke, is also mentioned by Mark (16 : 14) and by Paul (1 Cor. 15 : 5). But John alone distinguishes it from that which took place eight days after in similar circumstances, and at which the doubts of Thomas were overcome. And would it be too daring to suppose that, as the first of those appearances was meant to gather together the apostles whom Jesus wished to bring to Galilee, the second was intended to complete this reunion, which was hindered by the obstinate resistance of Thomas; consequently, that it was the unbelief of this disciple which prevented the immediate return of the apostles to Galilee, and forced them to remain at Jerusalem during the whole paschal week! Jesus did not lead back the flock until He had the number completed: "Of those whom Thou gavest me none is lost."

5. *The last Instructions:* vers. 44–49.—Vers. 44–49.* Meyer, Bleek, and others

* Ver. 44. ℵ. B. L. X. some Mnn. It^{plerique}, Vg., προς αυτους instead of αυτοις. 8 Mjj. some Mnn. omit μου after λογοι. Ver. 46. ℵ. B C. D. L. It^{plerique}, omit και ουτως δει after γεγραπται. Ver. 47. ℵ. B. Syr$^{sch.}$, μετανοιαν εις αφεσιν instead of μετανοιαν και αφεσιν. ℵ. B. C. L. N. X., αρξαμενοι instead of αρξαμενον. Ver. 48 B. D. omit εστε before μαρτυρες. Ver. 49. ℵ. D. L. Syr$^{sch.}$, It^{plerique}, Vg. omit ιδου. ℵ. B. L. X. Δ., εξαποστελλω instead of αποστελλω ℵ. B. C. D. L. It^{plerique}, Vg. omit Ιερουσαλημ after πολει.

think that all the sayings which follow were uttered this same evening, and that the ascension itself must, according to Luke, have followed immediately, during the night or toward morning. Luke corrected himself later in the Acts, where, according to a more exact tradition, he puts an interval of forty days between the resurrection and the ascension.* A circumstance which might be urged in favor of this hypothesis is, that what Luke omits in the angel's message (ver. 6) is precisely the command to the disciples to return to Galilee. But, on the other hand : 1. May it not be supposed that Luke, having reached the end of the first part of his history, and having the intention of repeating those facts as the point of departure for his second, thought it enough to state them in the most summary way? 2. Is it probable that an author, when beginning the second part of a history, should modify most materially, without in the least apprising his reader, the recital of facts with which he has closed his first? Would it not have been simpler and more honest on the part of Luke to correct the last page of his first volume, instead of confirming it implicitly as he does, Acts 1 : 1, 2? 3. The τότε, *then* (ver. 45), may embrace an indefinite space of time. 4. This more general sense harmonizes with the fragmentary character of the report given of those last utterances : *Now He said unto them*, ver. 44 : *and He said unto them*, ver. 46. This inexact form shows clearly that Luke abandons narrative strictly so called, to give as he closes the contents of the last sayings of Jesus, reserving to himself to develop later the historical account of those last days. 5. The author of our Gospel followed the same tradition as Paul (see the appearance to Peter, mentioned only by Paul and Luke). It is, moreover, impossible, considering his relations to that apostle and to the churches of Greece, that he was not acquainted with the first Epistle to the Corinthians. Now, in this epistle a considerable interval is necessarily supposed between the resurrection and the ascension, first because it mentions an appearance of Jesus to more than 500 brethren, which cannot have taken place on the very day of the resurrection ; and next, because it expressly distinguishes two appearances to the assembled apostles : the one undoubtedly that the account of which we have just been reading (1 Cor. 15 : 6) ; the other, which must have taken place later (ver. 7). These facts, irreconcilable with the idea attributed by Meyer and others to Luke, belonged, as Paul himself tells us, 1 Cor. 15 : 1–3, to the teaching generally received in the Church, to the παράδοσις. How could they have been unknown to such an investigator as Luke? How could they have escaped him in his first book, and that to recur to him without his saying a word in the second? Luke therefore here indicates summarily the substance of the different instructions given by Jesus between His resurrection and ascension all comprised in the words of the Acts : "After that He had given commandments unto the apostles" (Acts 1 : 2). Ver. 44 relates how Jesus recalled to them His previous predictions regarding His death and resurrection, which fulfilled the prophecies of the O. T. Οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι, an abridged phrase for ταῦτα ἐστιν οἱ λόγοι : "These events which have just come to pass are those of which I told you in the discourses which you did not understand." The expression : *while I was yet with you*, is remarkable ; for it proves that in the mind of Jesus, His separation from them was now consummated. He was with them only exceptionally ; His abode was elsewhere. The three terms ; *Moses*, *Prophets*, *Psalms*, may denote the three parts of the O. T. among the Jews : the Penta-

* This, be it remembered, is not our author's idea, but that of authors whose view he proceeds to overthrow. He has a way of putting himself in the place of an opponent, for the moment.—J. H.

teach ; the prophets, comprising, with the historical books (up to the exile), the prophetical books ; the Psalms, as representing the entire group of the hagiographa. Bleek rather thinks that Jesus mentions here only the books most essential from a prophetic point of view (*περὶ ἐμοῦ*). If it is once admitted that the division of the canon which we have indicated existed so early as the time of Jesus, the first meaning is the more natural.

Jesus closes these explanations by an act of power for which they were meant to prepare. He opens the inner sense of His apostles, so that the Scriptures shall henceforth cease to be to them a sealed book. This act is certainly the same as that described by John in the words (20 : 22) : "And He breathed on them, saying, Receive yet he Holy Ghost." The only difference is, that John names the efficient cause, Luke the effect produced. The miracle is the same as that which Jesus shall one day work upon Israel collectively, *when the veil shall be taken away* (2 Cor. 3 : 15, 16).

At ver. 46 there begins a new *resumé*—that of the discourses of the risen Jesus referring to the future, as the preceding bore on the past of the kingdom of God. Καὶ εἶπεν, *and He said to them again.* So true is it that Luke here gives the summary of the instructions of Jesus during the forty days (Acts 1 : 3), that we find the parallels of these verses scattered up and down in the discourses which the other Gospels give between the resurrection and ascension. The words : *should be preached among all nations*, recall Matt. 28 : 19 : "Go and teach all nations." and Mark 16 : 15 : "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." The words : *preaching repentance and remission of sins*, recall John 20 : 23 : "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them." Ver. 46 forms the transition from the past to the future (ver. 47). Ὅτι depends on : *it was so*, understood. The omission of καὶ οὕτως ἔδει, *thus it behoved*, by the Alex. cannot be justified ; it has arisen from negligence. Jesus declares two necessities : the one founded on prophecy (*thus it is written*), the other on the very nature of things (*it behoved*). The Alex. reading : *repentance unto pardon*, instead of *repentance and pardon*, has no internal probability. It would be a phrase without analogy in the whole of the N. T. The partic. ἀρξάμενον is a neut. impersonal accusative, used as a gerund. The Alex. reading ἀρξάμενοι is a correction. The thought that the kingdom of God must spread from Jerusalem belonged also to prophecy (Ps. 110 : 2, *et al.*) ; comp. Acts 1 : 8, where this idea is developed.

To carry out this work of preaching, there must be men specially charged with it. These are the apostles (ver. 48). Hence the ὑμεῖς, *ye*, heading the proposition. The thought of ver. 48 is found John 15 : 27 : that of ver. 49, John 15 : 26. A testimony so important can only be given worthily and effectively with divine aid (ver. 49). Ἰδού, *behold*, expresses the unforeseen character of this intervention of divine strength ; and ἐγώ, *I*, is foremost as the correlative of ὑμεῖς, *ye* (ver. 48) : "Ye, on the earth, give testimony ; and I, from heaven, give you power to do so." When the disciples shall feel the spirit of Pentecost, they shall know that it is the breath of Jesus glorified, and for what end it is imparted to them. In the phrase, *the promise of the Father*, the word *promise* denotes the thing promised. The Holy Spirit is the divine promise *par excellence*. It is in this supreme gift that all others are to terminate. And this aid is so indispensable to them, that they must beware of beginning the work before having received it. The command to *tarry in the city* is no wise incompatible with a return of the disciples to Galilee between the resurrection and ascension. Everything depends on the time when Jesus spoke this word ; it is not specified in the context. According to Acts 1 : 4, it was on the day of His ascension that Jesus gave them

this command. The Alex. reject the word *Jerusalem*, which indeed is not necessary after ver. 47.

On the Resurrection of Jesus.

I. *The Fact of the Resurrection.*—The apostles bore witness to the resurrection of Jesus, and on this testimony founded the Church. Such is the indubitable historical fact. Yet more: they did not do this as impostors. Strauss acknowledges this. And Volkmar, in his mystical language, goes the length of saying: "It is one of the most certain facts in the history of humanity, that shortly after His death on the cross, Jesus appeared to the apostles, risen from the dead, however we may understand the fact, which is without analogy in history" ("die Evangel." p. 612). Let us seek the explanation of the fact

Did Jesus return to life from a state of lethargy, as Schleiermacher thought? Strauss has once for all executed justice on this hypothesis. It cannot even be maintained without destroying the moral character of our Lord (comp. our "Comm. sur Jean," t. ii. p. 660 *et seq.*).

Were those appearances of Jesus to the first believers only visions resulting from their exalted state of mind? This is the hypothesis which Strauss, followed by nearly all modern rationalism, substitutes for that of Schleiermacher. This explanation breaks down before the following facts:

1. The apostles did not in the least expect the body of Jesus to be restored to life. They confounded the resurrection, as Weizsäcker says, with the Parousia. Now, such hallucinations would suppose, on the contrary, a lively expectation of the bodily reappearance of Jesus.

2. So far was the imagination of the disciples from creating the sensible presence of Jesus, that at the first they did not recognize Him (Mary Magdalene, the two of Emmaus). Jesus was certainly not to them an expected person, whose image was conceived in their own soul.

3. We can imagine the possibility of a hallucination in one person, but not in two, twelve, and finally, five hundred! especially if it be remembered that in the appearances described we have not to do with a simple luminous figure floating between heaven and earth, but with a person performing positive acts and uttering exact statements, which were heard by the witnesses. Or is the truth of the different accounts to be suspected? But they formed, from the beginning, during the lifetime of the apostles and first witnesses, the substance of the public preaching, of the received tradition (1 Cor. 15). Thus we should be thrown back on the hypothesis of imposture.

4. The empty tomb and the disappearance of the body remain inexplicable. If, as the narratives allege, the body remained in the hands of Jesus' friends, the testimony which they gave to its resurrection is an imposture, a hypothesis already discarded. If it remained in the hands of the Jews, how did they not by this mode of conviction overthrow the testimony of the apostles? Their mouths would have been closed much more effectually in this way than by scourging them. We shall not enter into the discussion of all Strauss's expedients to escape from this dilemma. They betray the spirit of special pleading, and can only appear to the unprejudiced mind in the light of subterfuges.* But Strauss attempts to take the offensive. Starting from Paul's enumeration of the various appearances (1 Cor. 15), he reasons thus: Paul himself had a vision on the way to Damascus; now he put all the appearances which the apostles had on the same platform; therefore they are all nothing but visions. This reasoning is a mere sophism. If Strauss means that Paul himself regarded the appearance which had converted him as a simple vision, it is easy to refute him. For what Paul wishes to demonstrate, 1 Cor. 15, is the bodily resurrection of believers, which he cannot do by means of the appearances of Jesus, unless he regards them all as bodily, the one as well as the other. If Strauss means, on the contrary, that the Damascus appearance was really nothing else than a vision, though Paul took it as a reality, the conclusion which he draws from this mistake of Paul's,

* In opposition to Strauss's supposition, that the body of Jesus was thrown to the dunghill, we set this fact of public notoriety in the time of St. Paul: "He was buried" (1 Cor. 15 : 3).

as to the meaning which must be given to all the others, has not the least logical value.

Or, finally, could God have permitted the Spirit of the glorified Jesus, manifesting itself to the disciples, to produce effects in them similar to those which a perception by the senses would have produced? So Weisse and Lotze think. Keim has also declared for this hypothesis in his "Life of Jesus." * But, 1. What then of the narratives in which we see the Risen One seeking to demonstrate to the apostles that He is not a pure spirit (Luke 24 : 37–40)? They are pure inventions, audacious falsehoods. 2. As to this glorified Jesus, who appeared spiritually to the apostles, did He or did He not mean to produce on them the impression that He was present bodily? If He did, this heavenly Being was an impostor. If not, He must have been very unskilful in His manifestations. In both cases, He is the author of the misunderstanding which gave rise to the false testimony given involuntarily by the apostles 3. The empty tomb remains unexplained on this hypothesis, as well as on the preceding. Keim has added nothing to what his predecessors have advanced to solve this difficulty. In reality, there is but one sufficient account to be given of the empty tomb : the tomb was found empty, because He who had been laid there Himself rose from it. To this opinion of Keim we may apply what holds of his explanation of miracles, and of his way of looking at the life of Jesus in general : it is too much or too little supernatural. It is not worth while combating the biblical accounts, when such enormous concessions are made to them ; to deny, for example, the miraculous birth, when we admit the absolute holiness of Christ, or the bodily resurrection, when we grant the reality of the appearances of the glorified Jesus. Keim for some time ascended the scale ; now he descends again. He could not stop there.

II. *The Accounts of the Resurrection.*—These accounts are in reality only reports regarding the appearances of the Risen One. The most ancient and the most official, if one may so speak, is that of Paul, 1 Cor. 15. It is the summary of the oral teaching received in the Church (ver. 2), of the tradition proceeding from all the apostles together (vers. 11–15). Paul enumerates the six appearances, as follows : 1. To Cephas ; 2. To the Twelve ; 3. To the 500 ; 4. To James ; 5. To the Twelve ; 6. To himself. We easily make out in Luke, Nos. 1, 2, 5 in his Gospel (24 : 34, ver. 36 *et seq.*, ver. 50 *et seq.*) ; No. 6 in the Acts. The appearance to James became food for Judeo Christian legends. It is elaborated in the apocryphal books. There remains No. 3, the appearance to the 500. A strange and instructive fact! No appearance of Jesus is better authenticated, more unassailable ; none was more public, and none produced in the Church so decisive an effect . . . and it is not mentioned, at least as such in any of our four Gospel accounts! How should this fact put us on our guard against the *argumentum è silentio*, of which the criticism of the present day makes so unbridled a use! How it ought to show the complete ignorance in which we are still left, and probably shall ever be, of the circumstances which presided over the formation of that oral tradition which has exercised so decisive an influence over our gospel historiography! Luke could not be ignorant of this fact if he had read but once the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, conversed once on the subject with St. Paul . . . and he has not mentioned, nor even dropped a hint of it! To bring down the composition of Luke by half a century to explain this omission, serves no end. For the further the time is brought down, the more impossible is it that the author of the Gospel should not have known the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians.

Matthew's account mentions only the two following appearances : 1. To the women at Jerusalem ; 2. To the Eleven, on a mountain of Galilee, where Jesus had appointed them to meet Him (*οὗ ἐτάξατο πορεύεσθαι*). We at once recognize in No. 1 the appearance to Mary Magdalene, John 20 : 1–17. The second is that gathering which Jesus had convoked, according to Matthew and Mark, before His death ; then, immediately after the resurrection, either by the angel or by His own mouth (Matthew). But it is now only that Matthew tells us of the rendezvous appointed for the disciples on the mountain. This confirms the opinion which we had already reached, viz., that we have here to do with a call which was not addressed to the Eleven only, but to all believers, even to the women. Jesus wished again to see all His brethren and to constitute His flock anew, which had been scattered by the death

* Otherwise in his "Geschichtl. Christus."

of the Shepherd. The choice of such a locality as that which Jesus had designated, confirms the conclusion that we have here to do with a numerous reunion. We cannot therefore doubt that it is the assembly of 500 spoken of by Paul, 1 Cor. 15. If Matthew does not expressly mention more than the Eleven, it is because to them was addressed the commission given by Jesus, "to go and baptize all nations." The expression : "but some doubted," is also more easily explained, if the Eleven were not alone.* Matthew did not intend to relate the first appearances by which the apostles, whether individually or together, were led to believe (this was the object of the appearances which took place at Jerusalem, and which are mentioned by Luke and John), but that which, in keeping with the spirit of his Gospel, he wished to set in relief as the climax of his history—that, namely, to which he had made allusion from the beginning, and which may be called the Messiah's taking possession of the whole world.

Mark's account is original as far as ver. 8. At ver. 9 we find : 1. An entirely new beginning ; 2. From ver. 8 a clearly marked dependence on Luke. After that, there occur from ver. 15, and especially in ver. 17, some very original sayings, which indicate an independent source. The composition of the work thus seems to have been interrupted at ver. 8, and the book to have remained unfinished. A sure proof of this is, that the appearance of Jesus announced to the women by the angel, ver. 7, is totally wanting, if, with the Sinaït., the Vatic., and other authorities, the Gospel is closed at ver. 8. From ver. 9, a conclusion has thus been added by means of our Gospel of Luke, which had appeared in the interval, and of some original materials previously collected with this view by the author (vers. 15, 16, and especially 17, 18).

III. *The Accounts taken as a Whole.*—If, gathering those scattered accounts, we unite them in one, we find ten appearances. In the first three, Jesus comforts and raises, for He has to do with downcast hearts : He comforts Mary Magdalene, who seeks His lost body ; He raises Peter after his fall ; He reanimates the hope of the two going to Emmaus. Thereafter, in the following three, He establishes the faith of His future witnesses in the decisive fact of His resurrection : He fulfils this mission toward the apostles in general, and toward Thomas ; and He reconstitutes the apostolate by returning to it its head. In the seventh and eighth appearances, He impresses on the apostolate that powerful missionary impulse which lasts still, and He adds James to the disciples, specially with a view to the mission for Israel. In the last two, finally, He completes the preceding commands by some special instructions (not to leave Jerusalem, to wait for the Spirit, etc.), and bids them His last farewell ; then, shortly afterward, He calls Paul specially with a view to the Gentiles. This unity, so profoundly psychological, so holily organic, is not the work of any of the evangelists, for its elements are scattered over the four accounts. The wisdom and love of Christ are its only authors.†

IV. *The Importance of the Resurrection.*—This event is not merely intended to mark out Jesus as the Saviour ; it is salvation itself, condemnation removed, death vanquished. We were perishing, condemned : Jesus dies. His death saves us ; He is the first who enjoys salvation. He rises again ; then in Him we are made to live again. Such an event is everything, includes everything, or it has no existence.

6. *The Ascension :* vers. 50–53.—The resurrection restored humanity in that one of its members who, by His holy life and expiatory death, conquered our two enemies

* If this expression is to be applied to the Eleven themselves, it must be explained by the summary character of this account, in which the first doubts expressed in the preceding appearances are applied to this, the only one related.

† See the remarkable development of this thought by M. Gess, in his new work, "Christi Zeugniss von seiner Person und seinem Werk," 1870, p. 193 *et seq.* "This progression in the appearances of Jesus is so wisely graduated, that we are not at liberty to refer it to a purely subjective origin. Supposing they were all related by one and the same evangelist, it might doubtless be attempted to make him the author of so well ordered a plan. But as this arrangement results only from combining the first, the third, and the fourth Gospels . . . this explanation also is excluded." Page 204.

—the law which condemned us because of sin, and death, which overtook us because of the condemnation of the law (1 Cor. 15 : 56). As this humanity is restored in the person of Christ by the fact of His resurrection, the ascension raises it to its full height; it realizes its destination, which from the beginning was to serve as a free instrument for the operations of the infinite God.

Vers. 50–53.* *The Ascension.*—Luke alone, in his Gospel and in the Acts, has given us a detailed view of the scene which is indicated by Paul, 1 Cor. 15 : 7, and assumed throughout the whole N. T. Interpreters like Meyer think themselves obliged to limit the ascension of Jesus to a purely spiritual elevation, and to admit no external visible fact in which this elevation was manifested. Luke's account was the production of a later tradition. We shall examine this hypothesis at the close.

The meaning of the ἐξήγαγε δέ, *Then He led them*, is simply this: "All these instructions finished, He led them . . ." This expression says absolutely nothing as to the time when the event took place. The term συναλιζόμενος, *having assembled*, Acts 1 : 4, proves that Jesus had specially convoked the apostles in order to take leave of them. Ἕως εἰς (T. R.), and still more decidedly ἕως πρός (Alex.), signifies, not *as far as*, but to about, in the direction and even to the neighborhood of . . . There is thus no contradiction to Acts 1 : 12.† Like the high priest when, coming forth from the temple, he blessed the people, Jesus comes forth from the invisible world once more, before altogether shutting Himself up within it, and gives His own a last benediction. Then, in the act of performing this deed of love, He is withdrawn to a distance from them toward the top of the mountain, and His visible presence vanishes from their eyes. The words καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν are omitted in the *Sinaït.*, the *Cantab.*, and some copies of the *Itala*. Could this phrase be the gloss of a copyist? But a gloss would probably have been borrowed from the narrative of the Acts, and that book presents no analogous expression. Might not this omission rather be, like so many others, the result of negligence, perhaps of confounding the two καί? We can hardly believe that Luke would have said so curtly, *He was parted from them*, without adding how. The imperfect ἀνεφέρετο, *He was carried up*, forms a picture. It reminds us of the θεωρεῖν, *behold*, John 6 : 62. The *Cantab.* and some MSS. of the *Itala* omit (ver. 52) the word προσκυνήσαντες, *having worshipped Him*, perhaps in consequence of confounding αὐταί and αὐτόν. The verb προσκυνειν, *to prostrate one's self*, in this context, can mean only the adoration which is paid to a divine being (Ps. 2 : 12). The joy of the disciples caused by this elevation of their Master, which is the pledge of the victory of His cause, fulfilled the word of Jesus: "If ye loved me, ye would rejoice because I go to my Father" (John 14 : 28). The point to be determined is, whether the more detailed account in Acts (the cloud, the two glorified men who appear) is an amplification of the scene due to the pen of Luke, or whether the account in the Gospel was only a sketch which he proposed to complete at the beginning of his second treatise, of which this scene was to form the starting-point. If our explanation of vers. 44–49 is well founded, we cannot but incline to the second

* Ver. 50. A. B. C. L. some Mnn. Syr^{sch}. omit εξω after αυτους. ℵ. B. C. D. L. 2 Mnn., εως προς instead of εως εις. Ver. 51. ℵ. D. It$^{aliq.}$ omit the words και ανεφερετο εις τον ουρανον. Ver. 52. D. It$^{aliq.}$ omit the words προσκυνησαντες αυτον. Ver. 53. D. It$^{aliq.}$ omit the words και ευλογουντες. ℵ. B. C. L. omit αινουντες και. ℵ. C. D. L. H. some Mnn. It$^{aliq.}$ omit αμην.

† See the interesting passage of M. Félix Bovet on the spot from which the ascension took place, "Voyage en Terre-Sainte," p. 225, *et seq.*

view. And the more we recognize up to this point in Luke an author who writes conscientiously and from conviction, the more shall we feel obliged to reject the first alternative. The numerous omissions, vers. 52, 53, in the *Cantab.* and some MSS. of the *Itala* cannot well be explained, except by the haste which the copyists seem to have made as they approached the end of their work. Or should the preference be given, as Tischendorf gives it, to this abridged text, contrary to all the other authorities together? D a b, which read αἰνοῦντες without καὶ εὐλογοῦντες; ℵ. B. C. L., which read εὐλογοῦντες without αἰνοῦντες καί, mutually condemn one another, and so confirm the received reading, *praising and blessing God.* Perhaps the omission in both cases arises from confounding the two—ντες. Αἰνεῖν, *to praise*, refers to the person of God; εὐλογεῖν, *to bless*, to His benefits. The disciples do here what was done at the beginning by the shepherds (2 . 20). But what a way traversed, what a series of glorious benefits between those two acts of homage! The last words, these in particular: "They were continually in the temple," form the transition to the book of Acts.

On the Ascension.

At first the apostles regarded the ascension as only the last of those numerous disappearances which they had witnessed during the forty days (ἀφαντος ἐγένετο, ver. 31). Jesus regarded it as the elevation of His person, *in the character of Son of man*, to that μορφὴ Θεοῦ (Phil. 2 : 6), that divine state which He had renounced when He came under the conditions of human existence. Having reached the term of His earthly career, He had asked back *His glory* (John 17 : 5); the ascension was the answer to His prayer.

Modern criticism objects to the reality of the ascension as an external fact, on the ground of the Copernican system, which excludes the belief that heaven is a particular place situated above our heads and beyond the stars. Those who raise this objection labor under a very gross misunderstanding. According to the biblical view, the ascension is not the exchange of one place for another, it is a change *of state*, and this change is precisely the emancipation from all confinement within the limits of space, exaltation to omnipresence. The cloud was, as it were, the veil which covered this transformation. The right hand of a God everywhere present cannot designate a particular place. Sitting at the right hand of God must also include omniscience, which is closely bound up with omnipresence, as well as omnipotence, of which the right hand of God is the natural symbol. The Apocalypse expresses in its figurative language the true meaning of the ascension, when it represents the glorified Son of man as the Lamb with seven horns (omnipotence) and seven eyes (omniscience). This divine mode of being does not exclude bodily existence in the case of Jesus. Comp., in Paul, the σωματικῶς, *bodily*, Col. 2 : 9, and the expression *spiritual body* applied to the second Adam, 1 Cor. 15 : 44. We cannot, from experience, form an idea of this glorified bodily existence. But it may be conceived as a power of appearing sensibly and of external activity, operating at the pleasure of the will alone, and at every point of space.

Another objection is taken from the omission of this scene in the other biblical documents. But, 1. Paul expressly mentions an appearance to all the apostles, 1 Cor. 15 : 7. Placed at the close of the whole series of previous appearances (among them that to the 500), and immediately before that which decided his own conversion, this appearance can only be the one at the ascension as related by Luke. This fact is decisive; for, according to vers. 3 and 11, it is the παράδοσις, the general tradition of the churches, proceeding from the apostles, which Paul sums up in this passage. 2. However Mark's mutilated conclusion may be explained, the words: "So then, after the Lord had thus spoken unto them, *He was received up into heaven*, and sat on the right hand of God," suppose some sensible fact or other, which served as a basis for such expressions. The same holds of the innumerable declarations of the epistles (Paul, Peter, Hebrews, James), which speak of the heavenly glory of Jesus and of

His sitting at the right hand of God. Doctrines, with the apostles, are never more than the commentary on facts. Such expressions must have a historical substratum. 3. No doubt, John does not relate the ascension. But can it be said that he does not mention it, when this saying occurs in his Gospel (6 : 62) : " What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where He was before?" The term *θεωρεῖν*, strictly *to contemplate*, and the pres. partic. *ἀναβαίνοντα*, *ascending*, forbid us to think of an event of a purely spiritual nature (comp. Bäumlein, *ad. h. l.*). Why, then, does he not relate the historical scene of the ascension ? Because, as his starting-point was taken *after* the baptism, which on this account he does not relate, his conclusion is placed *before* the ascension, which for this reason he leaves unrelated. The idea of his book was the development of faith in the minds of the apostles from its birth to its consummation. Now their faith was born with the visit of John and Andrew, chap. 1, after the baptism ; and it had received the seal of perfection in the profession of Thomas, chap. 20, before the ascension. That the evangelist did not think of relating *all* the appearances which he knew, is proved positively by that on the shores of the Lake of Gennesaret, which is related after the close of the book (20 : 30, 31), and in an appendix (chap. 21) composed either by the author himself (at least as far as ver. 23), or based on a tradition emanating from him. He was therefore aware of this appearance, and he had not mentioned it in his Gospel, like Luke, who could not be ignorant of the appearance to the 500, and who has not mentioned it either in his Gospel or in Acts. What reserve should such facts impose on criticism, however little gifted with caution ! 4. And the following must be very peculiarly borne in mind in judging of *Matthew's* narrative. It is no doubt strange to find this evangelist relating (besides the appearance to the women, which is intended merely to prepare for that following by the message which is given them) only a single appearance that which took place on the mountain of Galilee where Jesus had appointed His disciples, as well as the women and all the faithful, to meet Him, and where He gives the Eleven their commission. This appearance cannot be any of those which Luke and John place in Judea. It comes nearer by i s locality to that which, according to John 21, took place in Galilee ; but it cannot be identified with it, for the scene of the latter was the sea-shore. As we have seen, it can only be the appearance to the 500 mentioned by Paul. The meeting on a mountain is in perfect keeping with so numerous an assembly though Matthew mentions none but the Eleven, because the grand aim is that mission of world-wide evangelization which Jesus gives them that day. Matthew's intention was not, as we have already seen, to mention *all* the different appearances, either in Judea or Galilee, by which Jesus had reawakened the personal faith of the apostles, and concluded His earthly connection with them. His narrative had exclusively in view that solemn appearance in which Jesus declared Himself the Lord of the universe, the sovereign of the nations, and had given the apostles their mission to conquer for Him the ends of the earth. So true is it that his narrative must terminate in this supreme fact, that Jesus announced it before His death (Matt. 26 : 32), and that, immediately after the resurrection, the angel and Jesus Himself spoke of it to the women (28 : 7–10). Indeed, this scene was, in the view of the author of the first Gospel, the real goal of the theocratic revelation, the climax of the ancient covenant. If the day of the ascension was the most important in respect of the *personal development* of Jesus (Luke), the day of His appearance on the mountain showed the accomplishment of the Messianic programme sketched 1 : 1 : " Jesus, *the Christ*, the son of *David*, the son of *Abraham*." It was the decisive day for the establishment of the kingdom of God, which is Matthew's great thought. Criticism is on a false tack when it assumes that every evangelist has said all that he could have said. With oral tradition spread and received in the Church, the gospel historiography did not require to observe such an anxious gait as is supposed. It was not greatly concerned to relate an appearance more or less. The essential thing was to affirm the resurrection itself. The contrast between the detailed official enumeration of Paul, 1 Cor. 15, and each of our four Gospels, proves this to a demonstration. Especially does it seem to us thoroughly illogical to doubt the fact of the ascension, as Meyer does, because of Matthew's silence, and not to extend this doubt to all the appearances in Judea, about which he is equally silent.

The following passage from the letter of Barnabas has sometimes been used in evidence : " We celebrate with joy that eighth day on which Jesus rose from the

dead, and, after having manifested Himself, ascended to heaven." The author, it is said, like Luke, places the ascension and the resurrection on the same day. But it may be that in this expression he puts them, not on the same day taken absolutely, but on the same day *of the week, the eighth*, Sunday (which no doubt would involve an error as to the ascension). Or, indeed, this saying may signify, according to John 20 : 17, which in that case it would reproduce, that the ascending of Jesus to heaven began with the resurrection, and on that very day. In reality, from that time *He was no more with* His own, as He Himself says (Luke 24 : 44). He belonged to a higher sphere of existence. He only *manifested Himself* here below. He no longer lived here. *He was ascending*, to use His own expression. According to this view, His resurrection and the beginning of His elevation (*καὶ-καί*) therefore took place the same day. The expression : *after having manifested Himself*, would refer to the appearances which took place on the resurrection day, and after which He entered into the celestial sphere.

In any case, the resurrection once admitted as a real fact, the question is, how Jesus left the earth. By stealth, without saying a word? One fine day, without any warning whatever, He ceased to reappear? Is this mode of acting compatible with His tender love for his own? Or, indeed, according to M. de Bunsen, His body, exhausted by the last effort which His resurrection had cost Him (Jesus, according to this writer, was the author of this event by the energy of His will), succumbed in a missionary journey to Phenicia, where He went to seek believers among the Gentiles (John 10 : 17, 18 ; comp. with ver. 16) ; and having died there unknown, Jesus was likewise buried! But in this case, His body raised from the dead must have differed in no respect from the body which He had had during His life. And how are we to explain all the accounts, from which it appears that, between His resurrection and ascension, His body was already under peculiar conditions, and in course of glorification? The reality of such a fact as that related by Luke in his account of the ascension is therefore indubitable, both from the special standpoint of faith in the resurrection, and from the standpoint of faith in general. The ascension is a postulate of faith.

The ascension perfects in the person of the Son of man God's design in regard to humanity. To make of sanctified believers a family of children of God, perfectly like that only Son who is the prototype of the whole race—such is God's plan, His eternal *πρόθεσις* (Rom. 8 : 28, 29), with a view to which He created the universe. As the plant is the unconscious agent of the life of nature, man was intended to become the free and intelligent organ of the holy life of the personal God. Now, to realize this plan, God thought good (*εὐδόκησε*) to accomplish it first in ONE ; Eph. 2 : 6 : "He hath raised us up IN CHRIST, and made us sit IN HIM in the heavenly places ;" 1 : 10 : "According to the purpose which He had to gather together all things under ONE head, Christ ;" Heb. 2 : 10 : "Wishing to bring many sons to glory, He perfected THE CAPTAIN OF SALVATION." Such was, according to the divine plan, the first act of salvation. The second was to unite to this ONE individual believers, and thus to make them partakers of the divine state to which the Son of man had been raised (Rom. 8 : 29). This assimilation of the faithful to His Son God accomplished by means of two things, which are the necessary complement of the facts of the Gospel history : Pentecost, whereby the Lord's moral being becomes that of the believer ; and the Parousia, whereby the external condition of the sanctified believer is raised to the same elevation as that of our glorified Lord. First holiness, then glory, for the body as for the head : the baptism of Jesus, which becomes ours by Pentecost ; the ascension of Jesus, which becomes ours by the Parousia.

Thus it is that each Gospel, and not only that which we have just been explaining, has the Acts for its second volume, and for its third the Apocalypse.

CONCLUSION.

FROM our exegetical studies we pass to the work of criticism, which will gather up the fruits. This will bear on four points :

I. The characteristic features of our Gospel.

II. Its composition (aim, time, place, author).

III. Its sources, and its relation to the other two synoptics.

IV. The beginning of the Christian Church.

The first chapter will establish the facts ; in the following two we shall ascend from these to their causes ; the aim of the fourth is to replace the question of gospel literature in its historical position.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE THIRD GOSPEL.

We have to characterize this writing—1*st*. As a historical production ; 2*d*. As a religious work ; 3*d*. As a literary composition.

I.—*Historical Point of View.*

The distinctive features of Luke's narrative, viewed historiographically, appear to us to be : Fulness, accuracy, and continuity.

A. In respect of quantity, this Gospel far surpasses the other Syn. The entire matter contained in the three may be included in 172 sections.* Of this number, Luke has 127 sections, that is to say, three fourths of the whole, while Matthew presents only 114, or two thirds, and Mark 84, or the half.

This superiority in fulness which distinguishes Luke will appear still more, if we observe that, after cutting off the fifty six sections which are common to the three accounts, and form as it were the indivisible inheritance of the Syn., then the eighteen which are common to Luke and Matthew alone, finally the five which he has in common with Mark, there remain as his own peculiar portion, forty-eight—that is to say, more than a fourth of the whole materials, while Matthew has for his own only twenty-two, and Mark only five.

Once more, it is to be remarked that those materials which exclusively belong to

* There is necessarily much arbitrariness in the way of marking off those sections, as well as in the way in which the parallelism between the three narratives is established, especially as concerns the discourses which are more or less common to Matthew and Luke. M. Reuss (" Gesch. der heil. Schriften N. T."), making the sections larger, obtains only 124. This difference may affect considerably the figures, which indicate the comparative fulness of the three Gospels.

Luke are as important as they are abundant. We have, for example, the narratives of the infancy; those of the raising of the son of the widow of Nain, of the woman who was a sinner at the feet of Jesus, of the entertainment at the house of Martha and Mary, of the tears of Jesus over Jerusalem; the parables of the good Samaritan, the lost sheep and the lost drachma, the prodigal son, the faithless steward, the wicked rich man, the unjust judge, the Pharisee and the publican; the prayer of Jesus for His executioners, His conversation with the thief on the cross, the appearance to the two disciples going to Emmaus, the ascension. How diminished would the portrait be which remains to us of Jesus, and what an impoverishment of the knowledge which we have of His teachings, if all these pieces, which are preserved by Luke alone, were wanting to us!

B. But, where history is concerned, abundance is of less importance than accuracy. Is the wealth of Luke of good quality, and does his treasure not contain base coin? We believe that all sound exegesis of Luke's narrative will result in paying homage to his fidelity. Are the parts in question those which are peculiar to him—the accounts of the infancy (chaps. 1 and 2), the account of the journey (9 : 51—19 : 27) the view of the ascension (24 : 50–53)? We have found the first confirmed, so far as the central fact—the miraculous birth—is concerned, by the absolute holiness of Christ, which is the unwavering testimony of His consciousness, and which involves a different origin in His case from ours; and as to the details, by the purely Jewish character of the events and discourses—a character which would be inexplicable after the rupture between the Church and the synagogue. The supernatural in these accounts has, besides, nothing in common with the legendary marvels of the apocryphal books, nor even with the already altered traditions which appear in such authors as Papias and Justin, the nearest successors of the apostles, on different points of the Gospel history. In studying carefully the account of the journey, we have found that all the improbabilities which are alleged against it vanish. It is not a straight journey to Jerusalem; it is a slow and solemn itineration, all the incidents and adventures of which Jesus turns to account, in order to educate His disciples and evangelize the multitudes. He thus finds the opportunity of visiting a country which till then had not enjoyed His ministry, the southern parts of Galilee, adjacent to Samaria, as well as Perea. Thereby an important blank in His work in Israel is filled up. Finally, the sketch of that prolonged journey to Jerusalem, without presenting exactly the same type as John's narrative, which divides this epoch into four distinct journeys (to the feast of Tabernacles, chap. 8; to the feast of Dedication, chap. 10; to Bethany, chap. 11; to the last Passover, chap. 12), yet resembles it so closely, that it is impossible not to take this circumstance as materially confirming Luke's account. It is a first, though imperfect, rectification of the abrupt contrast between the Galilean ministry and the last sojourn at Jerusalem which characterizes the synoptical view; it is the beginning of a return to the full historical truth restored by John.*

We have found the account of the ascension not only confirmed by the apostolic

* Sabatier ("Essai sur les sources de la vie de Jésus," pp 31 and 32: "Luke, without seeking or intending it, but merely as the result of his new investigations, has destroyed the factitious framework of the synoptical tradition, and has given us a glimpse of a new one, larger, without being less simple. Luke is far from having cleared away every difficulty. . . . He had too much light to be satisfied with following in the track of his predecessors; he had not enough to reach the full reality of the Gospel history. He thus serves admirably to form the transition between the first two Gospels and the fourth.")

view of the glorification of Jesus which fills the epistles, by the last verses of Mark, and by the saying of Jesus, John 6 : 62, but also by the express testimony of Paul, 1 Cor. 15 : 7, to an appearance granted to *all the apostles*, which must have taken place between that granted to the 500 brethren and that on the way to Damascus.

So far, then, from regarding those parts as arbitrary additions which Luke took the liberty of making to the Gospel history, we are bound to recognize them as real historical data, which serve to complete the beginning, middle, and end of our Lord's life.

We think we have also established the almost uniform accuracy shown by Luke in distributing, under a multitude of different occasions, discourses which are grouped by Matthew in one whole ; we have recognized the same character of fidelity in the historical introductions which he almost always prefixes to those discourses. After having established, as we have done, the connection between the saying about the lilies of the field and the birds of the air and the parable of the foolish rich man (chap. 12), the similar relation between the figures used in the lesson about prayer and the parable of the importunate friend (chap. 11)—who will prefer, historically speaking, the place assigned by Matthew to those two lessons in the Sermon on the Mount, where the images used lose the exquisite fitness which in Luke they derive from their connection with the narratives preceding them? What judicious critic, after feeling the breach of continuity which is produced on the Sermon on the Mount by the insertion of the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6), will not prefer the characteristic scene which Luke has described of the circumstances in which this form of prayer was taught to the apostles (Luke 11 : 1, *et seq.*)? How can we doubt that the menacing farewell to the cities of Galilee was uttered at the time at which Luke has it (chap. 10), immediately after his departure, 9 : 51, rather than in the middle of the Galilean ministry, where it is put by Matthew? The same is true of the cases in which the sayings of Jesus can only be fully explained by the surroundings in which Luke places them ; *e.g.*, the answers of Jesus to the three aspirants after the kingdom of God (chap. 9) would be incomprehensible and hardly justifiable on the eve of a mere excursion to the other side of the sea (Matt. 8), while they find their full explanation at the time of a final departure (Luke).

The introductions with which Luke prefaces those occasional teachings are not in favor with modern critics.* Yet Holtzmann acknowledges the historical truth of some—of those, for example, which introduce the Lord's Prayer and the lesson upon avarice (chap. 12). We have ourselves established the accuracy of a very large number, and shown that they contain the key to the discourses which follow, and that commentators have often erred from having neglected the indications which they contain (see on 13 : 23, 14 : 25, 15 : 1, 2, 16 : 1, 14, 17 : 20, 18 : 1, 19 : 11). What confirms the really historical character of those notices is, that there is a certain number of doctrinal teachings which want them, and which Luke is satisfied to set down without connection and without introduction after one another : so with the four

* Weizsäcker is the author who abuses them most : " No value can be allowed to the historical introductions of Luke" (" Untersuch," p. 139). It is true that he is necessarily led to this estimate by his opinion regarding the general conformity of the great discourses of Matthew to the common apostolic sources of Matthew and Luke, the Logia. If Matthew is, of the two evangelists, the one who faithfully reproduces this original, Luke must have arbitrarily dislocated the great bodies of discourse found in Matthew ; and in this case, the historical introductions must be his own invention.

precepts, 17 : 1–10. Certainly, if he had allowed himself to invent situations, it would not have been more difficult to imagine them for those sayings than for so many others.

If finally, we compare the parallel accounts of Luke and of the other two synoptics, we find, both in the description of facts and in the tenor of the sayings of Jesus, a very remarkable superiority on the part of Luke in respect of accuracy. We refer to the prayer of Jesus at the time of His baptism, and before His transfiguration—the human factor, as it is, which leads to the divine interposition, and takes from it that abrupt character which it appears to have in the other accounts. In the temptation, the transposition of the last two acts of the struggle, in the transfiguration, the mention of the subject of the conversation of Jesus with Moses and Elias, throw great light on those scenes taken as a whole, which in the other synoptics are much less clear (see the passages).

We know that Luke is charged with grave historical errors. According to M. Rénan (" Vie de Jésus," p. 39 *et seq.*), certain declarations are " pushed to extremity and rendered false ;" for example, 14 : 26, where Luke says : " If any man *hate* not his father and mother," where Matthew is content with saying, " He that *loveth* father or mother *more* than me." We refer to our exegesis of the passage. " He exaggerates the marvellous ;" for example, the appearance of the angel in Gethsemane. As if Matthew and Mark did not relate a perfectly similar fact, which Luke omits, at the close of the account of the temptation ! " He commits chronological errors ;" for example, in regard to Quirinius and Lysanias. Luke appears to us right, so far as Lysanias is concerned ; and as to Quirinius, considering the point at which researches now stand, an impartial historian will hardly take the liberty of condemning him unconditionally. According to Keim, Luke is evidently wrong in placing the visit to Nazareth at the opening of the Galilean ministry ; but has he not given us previously the description of the general activity of Jesus in Galilee (4 : 14 and 15)? And is not the saying of ver. 23, which supposes a stay at Capernaum previous to this visit, to be thus explained ? And, further, do not Matt. 4 : 13 and John 2 : 12 contain indisputable proofs of a return on the part of Jesus to Nazareth in the very earliest times of His Galilean ministry ? According to the same author, Luke makes Nain in Galilee a city of Judea ; but this interpretation proceeds, as we have seen, from an entire misunderstanding of the context (see on 7 : 17). It is alleged, on the ground of 17 : 11, that he did not know the relative positions of Samaria and Galilee. We are convinced that Luke is as far as possible from being guilty of so gross a mistake. According to M. Sabatier (p. 29), there is a contradiction between the departure of Jesus by way of Samaria (9 : 52) and His arriving in Judea by Jericho (18 : 35) ; but even if the plan of Jesus had been to pass through Samaria, the refusal of the Samaritans to receive Him would have prevented Him from carrying it out. And had He, in spite of this, passed through Samaria, He might still have arrived by way of Jericho ; for from the earliest times there has been a route from north to south on the right bank of the Jordan. Finally, he is charged with certain faults which he shares with the other two synoptics. But either those mistakes have no real existence, as that which refers to the day of Jesus' death, or Luke does not share them—*e.g.*, that which leads Matthew and Mark to place John's imprisonment before the first return of Jesus to Galilee, or the charge of inaccuracy attaches to him in a less degree than to his colleagues, as in the case of the omission of the journeys of Jesus to Jerusalem.

There is a last observation to be made on the historical character of Luke's narrative. It occupies an intermediate position between the other three Gospels. It has a point in common with Matthew—the doctrinal teachings of Jesus ; it has also a point of contact with Mark—the sequence of the accounts, which is the same over a large portion of the narrative ; it has likewise several features in common with John : the chief is, that considerable interval which in both of them divides the end of the Galilean ministry from the last sojourn at Jerusalem. Thereto must be added some special details, such as the visit to Martha and Mary, as well as the characteristics of those two women, which harmonize so well with the sketch of the family of Bethany drawn by John (chap. 11) ; next, the dispute of the disciples at the close of the Holy Supper, with the lessons of Jesus therewith connected—an account the connection of which with that of the feet-washing in John (chap. 13) is so striking. And thus, while remaining entirely independent of the other three, the Gospel of Luke is nevertheless confirmed and supported simultaneously by them all.

From all those facts established by exegesis, it follows that, if Luke's account has not, like that of John, the fulness and precision belonging to the narrative of an eye-witness, it nevertheless reaches the degree of fidelity which may be attained by a historian who draws his materials from those sources which are at once the purest and the nearest to the facts.

C. An important confirmation of the accuracy of Luke's account arises from the continuity, the well marked historical progression, which characterizes it. If he is behind John in this respect, he is far superior to Matthew and Mark.

Though the author did not tell us in his prologue, we should easily discover that his purpose is to depict the gradual development of the work of Christianity. He takes his starting point at the earliest origin of this work—the announcement of the forerunner's birth ; it is the first dawning of the new day which is rising on humanity. Then come the birth and growth of the forerunner— the birth and growth of Jesus Himself. The physical and moral development of Jesus is doubly sketched, before and after His first visit to Jerusalem at the age of twelve ; a scene related only by Luke, and which forms the link of connection between the infancy of Jesus and His public ministry. With the baptism begins the development of His work, the continuation of that of His person. From this point the narrative pursues two distinct and parallel lines : on one side, the progress of the new work ; on the other, its violent rupture with the old work, Judaism The progress of the work is marked by its external increase. At first, Capernaum is its centre ; thence Jesus goes forth in all directions (4 : 43, 44) : Nain to the west, Gergesa to the east, Bethsaïda-Julias to the north ; then Capernaum ceases to be the centre of His excursions (8 : 1–3), and quitting those more northern countries entirely, He proceeds to evangelize southern Galilee and Perea, upon which He had not yet entered (9 : 51), and repairs by this way to Jerusalem. Side by side with this external progress goes the moral development of the work itself. Surrounded at first by a certain number of *believers* (4 : 38–42), Jesus soon calls some of them to become His permanent *disciples* and fellow-laborers (5 : 1–11, 27, 28). A considerable time after, when the work has grown, He chooses twelve from the midst of this multitude of disciples, making them His more immediate followers, and calling them *apostles.* Such is the foundation of the new edifice. The time at length comes when they are no longer sufficient for the wants of the work. Then seventy new evangelists are added to them. The death of Jesus suspends for some time the progress of the work ; but after His resurrection the

apostolate is reconstituted ; and soon the ascension, by placing the Master on the throne, gives Him the means of elevating His fellow-laborers to the full height of that mission which they have to carry out in His name. Is not the concatenation of the narrative faultless? And is not this exposition far superior as a historical work to the systematic juxtaposition of homogeneous masses in Matthew, or to the series of anecdotes characteristic of Mark? The same gradation meets us in another line, that of the facts which mark the rupture between the new work and Israel with its official representatives. First it is the inhabitants of Nazareth, who refuse to recognize as the Messiah their former fellow-townsman (chap. 4) ; afterward it is the scribes who have come from Jerusalem, who deny His right to pardon sins, accuse Him of breaking the Sabbath (chap. 5 and 6), and, on seeing His miracles and hearing His answers, become almost mad with rage (6 : 11) ; it is Jesus who announces His near rejection by the Sanhedrim (9 : 22), and the death which awaits Him at Jerusalem (ver. 31) ; it is the woe pronounced on the cities of Galilee (chap. 10) and on that whole generation which shall one day be condemned by the queen of the south and the Ninevites ; then we have the divine woe uttered at a feast face to face with the Pharisees and scribes, and the violent scene which follows this conflict (chaps. 11 and 12) ; the express announcement of the rejection of Israel and of the desolation of the country, especially of Jerusalem (chap. 13) ; the judgment and crucifixion of Jesus breaking the last link between Messiah and His people ; the resurrection and ascension emancipating His person from all national connections, and completely spiritualizing His kingdom. Thus, in the end, the work begun at Bethlehem is traced to its climax, both in its internal development and its external emancipation.

It is with the view of exhibiting this steady progress of the divine work in the two respects indicated, that the author marks off his narrative from the beginning by a series of general remarks, which serve as resting-places by the way, and which describe at each stage the present position of the work. These brief representations, which serve both as summaries and points of outlook, are always distinguished by the use of the descriptive tense (the imperfect) ; the resuming of the history is indicated by the reappearance of the narrative tense (the aor.). The following are the chief passages of this kind : 1 : 80, 2 : 40, 52, 3 : 18, 4 : 15, 37, 44, 5 : 15, 16, 8 : 1, 9 : 51, 13 : 22, 17 : 11, 19 : 28, 47, 48, 21 : 37, 38, 24 : 53 (a last word, which closes the Gospel, and prepares for the narrative of the Acts). If those expressions are more and more distant in proportion as the narrative advances from the starting-point, it is because the further the journey proceeds, the less easy is it to measure its progress.

What completes the proof that this characteristic of continuity is not accidental in Luke's narrative, is the fact that exactly the same feature meets us in the book of Acts. Here Luke describes the birth and growth of the Church, precisely as he described in his Gospel the birth and growth of the person and work of Jesus. The narrative takes its course from Jerusalem to Antioch and from Antioch to Rome, as in the Gospel it proceeded from Bethlehem to Capernaum and from Capernaum to Jerusalem. And it is not only in the line of the progress of the work that the Acts continue the Gospel ; it is also along that of the breach of the kingdom of God with the people of Israel. The rejection of the apostolic testimony and the persecution of the Twelve by the Sanhedrim ; the rejection of Stephen's preaching, his martyrdom, and the dispersion of the Church which results from it ; the martyrdom of James (chap. 12) ; the uniform repetition of the contumacious conduct of Israel in every city of the world where Paul is careful to preach first in the synagogue ; the machin-

ations of the Jews against him on occasion of his arrest at Jerusalem, from which he escapes only by the impartial interposition of the Roman authorities ; and finally, in the closing scene (chap. 28), the decisive rejection of the Gospel by the Jewish community at Rome, the heart of the empire : such are the steps of that ever-growing separation between the Church and the synagogue, of which this last scene forms as it were the finishing stroke.

It is interesting to observe that the series of general expressions which marks off the line of progress in the Gospel is continued in the Acts ; it is the same course which is followed : 1 : 14, 2 : 42–47, 4 : 32–34, 5 : 12, 13, 42, 6 : 7, 8 : 4, 5, 9 : 31, 12 : 24, 13 : 52, 19 : 20, 24 : 26, 27, 28 : 30, 31 (the last word, which is the conclusion of the narrative). The periodical recurrence of those expressions would suffice to prove that one and the same hand composed both the Gospel and the Acts ; for this form is found nowhere else in the N. T.

By all those features we recognize the superiority of Luke's narrative as a historical work. Matthew groups together doctrinal teachings in the form of great discourses ; he is a preacher. Mark narrates events as they occur to his mind ; he is a chronicler. Luke reproduces the external and internal development of the events ; he is the historian properly so called. Let it be remarked that the three characteristics which we have observed in his narrative correspond exactly to the three main terms of his programme (1 : 3) ; fulness, to the word πᾶσιν (*all things*) ; accuracy, to the word ἀκριβῶς (*exactly*) ; and continuity, to the word καθεξῆς (*in order*). It is therefore with a full consciousness of his method that Luke thus carried out his work. He traced a programme for himself, and followed it faithfully.

II.—*Religious Point of View.*

It is on this point that modern criticism has raised the most serious discussions. The Tübingen school, in particular, has endeavored to prove that our third Gospel, instead of being composed purely and simply in the service of historical truth, was written in the interest of a particular tendency—that of the Christianity of Paul, which was entirely different from primitive and apostolic Christianity.

There is an unmistakable affinity of a remarkable kind between the contents of Luke and what the Apostle Paul in his epistles frequently calls *his Gospel*, that is to say, the doctrine of the universality and entire freeness of the salvation offered to man without any legal condition. At the beginning the angels celebrate the good-will of God *to* (all) *men*. Simeon foreshadows the breach between the Messiah and the majority of His people. Luke alone follows out the quotation of Isaiah relative to the ministry of John the Baptist, including the words : "And *all flesh* shall see the salvation of God." He traces the genealogy back to *Adam*. The ministry of Jesus opens with His visit to Nazareth, which forms an express prelude to the unbelief of Israel. The paralytic and the woman who was a sinner obtain pardon by *faith* alone. The sending of the seventy evangelists prefigures the evangelization of all nations. The part played by the Samaritan in the parable exhibits the superiority of that people's moral disposition to that of the Israelites. The four parables of the lost sheep and the lost drachma, the prodigal son, the Pharisee and the publican, are the doctrine of Paul exhibited in action. That of the marriage supper (chap. 14) adds to the calling of sinners in Israel (ver. 21) that of the Gentiles (vers 22 and 23). The teaching regarding the unprofitable servant (17 : 7–10) tears up the righteousness of works by

the roots. The gratitude of the leprous Samaritan, compared with the ingratitude of the nine Jewish lepers, again exhibits the favorable disposition of this people, who are strangers to the theocracy. Salvation abides in the house of Zaccheus the publican from the moment he has believed. The form of the institution of the Holy Supper is almost identical with that of Paul, 1 Cor. 11. The sayings of Jesus on the cross related by Luke—His prayer for His executioners, His promise to the thief, and His last invocation to His Father—are all three words of grace and faith. The appearances of the risen Jesus correspond almost point for point to the enumeration of Paul, 1 Cor. 15. The command of Jesus to the apostles to "preach repentance and the remission of sins *to all nations*," is as it were the programme of that apostle's work; and the scene which closes the Gospel, that of Jesus leaving His own in the act of blessing them, admirably represents its spirit.

This assemblage of characteristic features belonging exclusively to Luke admits of no doubt that a special relation existed between the writing of this evangelist and the ministry of St. Paul; and that granted, we can hardly help finding a hint of this relation in the dedication addressed to Theophilus, no doubt a Christian moulded by Paul's teaching: "That thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed" (see p. 39).

But this indisputable fact seems to be opposed by another not less evident—the presence in this same Gospel of a large number of elements wholly Jewish in their nature, or what is called at the present day the *Ebionism* of Luke.

This same historian, so partial to Paul's universalism, makes the new work begin in the sanctuary of the ancient covenant, in the holy place of the temple of Jerusalem. The persons called to take part in it are recommended to this divine privilege by their irreproachable fidelity to all legal observances (1 : 6–15). The Messiah who is about to be born shall ascend the throne *of David his father;* His kingdom shall be the restored *house of Jacob* (vers. 32, 33); and the salvation which He will bring to His people shall have for its culminating point Israel's perfect celebration of worship freed from their enemies (vers. 74, 75). Jesus Himself is subject from the outset to all legal obligations; He is circumcised and presented in the temple on the days and with all the rites prescribed, and His parents do not return to their house, it is expressly said, "till they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord." At the age indicated by theocratic custom, He is brought for the first time to the feast of Passover, where, according to the narrative, "His parents went every year." As the condition of participating in the Messiah's kingdom, the people receive from the mouth of John the Baptist merely the appointment of certain works of righteousness and beneficence to be practised. If, in His ministry, Jesus has no scruple in violating the additions with which the doctors had surrounded the law as with a hedge—for example, in His Sabbatic miracles—He nevertheless remains subject to the Mosaic ordinance even in the matter of the Sabbath. He sends the healed leper to offer sacrifice at Jerusalem, *as a testimony* of His reverence for Moses. Eternal life consists, according to Him, in fulfilling the sum (10 : 26–28) or the commandments of the law (18 : 18–20). In the case of the woman whom He cures on the Sabbath day, He loves to assert her title as a *daughter of Abraham* (13 : 16). He goes the length even of affirming (16 : 17) that "*not one tittle of the law* shall fail." The true reason of that perdition which threatens the Pharisees, represented by the wicked rich man, is their not hearing *Moses and the prophets*. Even at the very close of Jesus' ministry, the women who surround him, out of respect for the Sabbath, break off their preparations for

embalming His body ; "*and*, it is expressly said, *they rested on the Sabbath day according to the commandment*" (23 : 56). Finally, it is Jerusalem which is to be the starting-point of the new preaching ; it is in this city that the apostles are to wait for power from on high. It is in the temple that they abide continually, after the ascension. The narrative closes in the temple, as it was in the temple that it opened (24 : 53).

If Paul's conception is really *antinomian*, hostile to Judaism and the law, and if Luke wrote in the interest of this view, as is alleged by the Tübingen school, how are we to explain this second series of facts and doctrines, which is assuredly not less prominent in our Gospel than the first series? Criticism here finds itself in a difficulty, which is betrayed by the diversity of explanations which it seeks to give of this fact. Volkmar cuts the Gordian knot ; according to him, those Jewish elements have no existence. The third Gospel is *purely* Pauline. That is easier to affirm than to demonstrate ; he is the only one of his school who has dared to maintain this assertion, overthrown as it is by the most obvious facts. Baur acknowledges the facts, and explains them by admitting a later rehandling of our Gospel. The first composition, the primitive Luke, being exclusively Pauline, Ebionite elements were introduced later by the anonymous author of our canonical Luke, and that with a conciliatory view. But Zeller has perfectly proved to his master that this hypothesis of a primitive Luke different from ours is incompatible with the unity of tendency and style which prevails in our Gospel, and which extends even to the second part of the work, the book of Acts. The Jewish elements are not *veneered* on the narrative ; they belong to the substance of the history. And what explanation does Zeller himself propose? The author, personally a decided Paulinist, was convinced that, to get the system of his master admitted by the Judeo-Christian party, they must not be offended. He therefore thought it prudent to mix up in his treatise pieces of both classes, some Pauline, fitted to spread his own view ; others Judaic, fitted to flatter the taste of readers till now opposed to Paul's party. From this Machiavelian scheme the work of Luke proceeded, with its two radically contradictory currents.*

But before having recourse to an explanation so improbable both morally and rationally, as we shall find when we come to examine it more closely when treating of the aim of our Gospel, is it not fair to inquire whether there is not a more natural one contrasting less offensively with that character of sincerity and simplicity which strikes every reader of Luke's narrative? Was not the Old Covenant with its legal forms the divinely-appointed preparation for the new? Was not the new with its pure spirituality the divinely-purposed goal of the old? Had not Jeremiah already declared that the days were coming when God Himself would abolish the covenant which He had made at Sinai with the fathers of the nation, and when He would substitute a *New Covenant*, the essential character of which would be, that the law should be written no longer on tables of stone, but on the heart ; no longer before us, but in us (31 : 31–34)? This promise clearly established the fact that the Messianic era would be at once the abolition of the law in the letter, and its eternal fulfilment in

* Overbeck, another savant of the same school, in his commentary on the Acts (a re-edition of De Wette's), combats in his turn the theory of Zeller, and finds in the work of Luke the product, not of an ecclesiastical scheme, but of Paulinism in its decadence (see chap. 2 of this Conclusion). As to Keim, he has recourse to the hypothesis of an Ebionite Gospel, which was the first material on which Luke, the disciple of Paul, wrought (see chap. 3). We see : *Tot capita, tot sensus.*

the spirit. And such is precisely the animating thought of the Gospel history, as it has been traced by Luke ; his narrative depicts the gradual substitution of the dispensation of the spirit for that of the letter. The Mosaic economy is the starting-point of his history ; Jesus Himself begins under its government ; it is under this divine shelter that He grows, and His work matures. Then the spirituality of the Gospel is formed and gradually developed in His person and work, and getting rid by degrees of its temporary wrapping, ends by shining forth in all its brightness in the preaching and work of St. Paul. Mosaic economy and spirituality are not therefore, as criticism would have it, two opposite currents which run parallel or dash against one another in Luke's work. Between Ebionism and Paulinism there is no more contradiction than between the blossom, under the protection of which the fruit forms, and that fruit itself, when it appears released from its rich covering. The substitution of fruit for flower is the result of an organic transformation ; it is the very end of vegetation. Only the blossom does not fade away in a single day, any more than the fruit itself ripens in a single day. Jesus declares in Luke, that when new wine is offered to one accustomed to drink old wine, he turns away from it at once ; for he says : *The old is better.* Agreeably to this principle, God does not deal abruptly with Israel ; for this people, accustomed to the comparatively easy routine of ritualism, He provided a transition period intended to raise it gradually from legal servility to the perilous but glorious liberty of pure spirituality. This period is that of the development of Jesus Himself and of His work. The letter of the law was scrupulously respected, because the Spirit was not present to replace it ; this admirable and divine work is what the Gospel of Luke invites us to contemplate : Jesus, as *a minister of the circumcision* (Rom. 15 : 8), becoming the organ of the Spirit. And even after Pentecost, the Spirit still shows all needful deference to the letter of the divine law, and reaches its emancipation only in the way of rendering to it uniform homage ; such is the scene set before us by the book of Acts in the conduct of the apostles, and especially in that of St. Paul. To explain therefore the two series of apparently heterogeneous pieces which we have indicated, we need neither Volkmar's audacious denial respecting the existence of one of them, nor the subtile hypothesis of two different Paulinisms in Luke, the one more, the other less hostile to Judeo-Christianity (Baur), nor the supposition of a shameless deception on the part of the forger who composed this writing (Zeller). It is as little necessary to ascribe to the author, with Overbeck, gross misunderstanding of the true system of his master Paul, or to allege, as Keim seems to do, that he clumsily placed in juxtaposition, and without being aware of it, two sorts of materials drawn from sources of opposite tendencies. All such explanations of a system driven to extremity vanish before the simple fact that the Ebionism and Paulinism of Luke belong both alike, as legitimate, necessary, successive elements, to the real history of Jesus and His apostles—the one as the inevitable point of departure, the other as the intended goal ; and that the period which separated the one from the other served only to replace the one gradually by the other. By giving those two principles place with equal fulness in his narrative, Luke, far from guiding two contradictory tendencies immorally or unskilfully, has kept by the pure objectivity of history. Nothing proves this better than that very appearance of contradiction which he could brave, and which gives modern criticism so much to do.

Let it be remarked that the truth of the so-called Pauline elements in Luke's Gospel is fully borne out by the presence of similar elements in the other two synoptics. Ritschl, in his beautiful work on the beginnings of the ancient Catholic Church, shows

how the one saying of Jesus, preserved in Mark and Matthew as well as in Luke: "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath," already implied the future abolition of the whole Mosaic law. The same is evidently true of the following (Matt. 15 and Mark 7): "Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man; but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth him." The whole Levitical law fell before this maxim logically carried out. We may also cite the saying, Matt. 8 : 11 : "I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west; . . . but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out," though it is arbitrarily alleged that it was added later to the apostolic Matthew; then that which announces the substitution of the Gentiles for Israel, in the parable of the husbandmen: "The kingdom shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (21 : 43), a saying which Matthew alone has preserved to us; finally, the command given to the apostles to go and baptize *all nations* (28 : 19), which necessarily belonged to the original Matthew: for, 1. The appearance with which it is connected is announced long before (Matt. 26 : 32); 2. Because it is the only one related in this Gospel, and therefore could not be wanting in the original record; 3. Because Jesus certainly did not appear to His disciples to say nothing to them. But the most decisive saying related by our three synoptics is the parable of the old garment and the piece of new cloth (see on this passage, 5 : 36) Paul has affirmed nothing more trenchant respecting the opposition between the law and the gospel.

The fundamental principles of Paulinism, the abolition of the law, the rejection of Israel and the calling of the Gentiles, are not therefore any importation of Paul or Luke into the gospel of Jesus. They belonged to the Master's teaching, though the time had not yet come for developing all their consequences practically.

This general question resolved, let us examine in detail the points which criticism still attempts to make good in regard to the subject under discussion. It is alleged that, under the influence of Paul's doctrine, Luke reaches a conception of the person of Christ which transcends that of the other two synoptics. "He softens the passages which had become embarrassing from the standpoint of a more exalted idea of the divinity of Jesus" (Réuan); for example, he omits Matt. 24 : 36, which ascribes the privilege of omniscience to the Father only. But did he do so intentionally? Was he acquainted with this saying? We have just seen another omission which he makes (p. 488); we shall meet with many more still, in which the proof of an opposite tendency might be quite as legitimately alleged. Is it not Luke who makes the centurion say, "Certainly this was a *righteous man*," while the other two represent him as saying, "This was the *Son of God?*" What a feeble basis for the edifice of criticism do such differences present!

The great journey across the countries situated between Galilee and Samaria was invented, according to Baur, with the view of bringing into relief the non-Israelitish country of Samaria. Luke thus sought to justify Paul's work among the Gentiles. But would Luke labor at the same moment to overthrow what he is building up, by inventing the refusal of the Samaritans to receive Jesus? Besides, it is wholly untrue that Samaria is the scene of the journey related in this part. Was it then in Samaria that Jesus conversed with a doctor of the law (10 : 25), that He dined with a Pharisee, that He came into conflict with a company of scribes (11 : 37–53), that He cured in the synagogue a daughter of Abraham (13 : 16), etc. etc.? There is found, no doubt, among the ten lepers one who is of Samaritan origin (17 : 16); but if this circumstance can lead us to suppose that the scene passes in Samaria, the presence of nine

Jewish lepers should make it appear nine times more probable that it transpires on Israelitish territory.

In the instructions given to the Twelve, Luke omits the saying, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not." Neither do we find the answer addressed to the Canaanitish woman, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." But, as to the first, Mark omits it as well as Luke. Could this also arise from a dogmatic tendency? But how, in that case, should he relate the second as well as Matthew? The first then was simply wanting in his source; why not also in Luke's, which in this very narrative seems to have had the greatest conformity to that of Mark? As to the second saying, it belongs not only to a narrative, but to a whole cycle of narratives which is completely wanting in Luke (two whole chapters). Besides, does not Luke also omit the peculiarly Pauline saying, "Come unto me, all ye who labor and are heavy laden, and ye shall find rest unto your souls?" Could this also be a dogmatical omission? And as to the saying, "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached over all the earth," in connection with which Holtzmann himself asks the Tübingen critics whether Luke passes it over in silence in a Pauline interest! Those declarations were simply wanting in his documents. Why not also those particularistic sayings? They would certainly not have caused Luke more embarrassment than they did to Matthew, who sees in them no contradiction to the command which closes his Gospel, "Go and baptize all nations." It is evident that the prohibition addressed to the disciples (Matt. 10) was only temporary, and applied only to the time during which Jesus as a rule restricted His sphere of action to Israel; from the time that His death and resurrection released Him from His national surroundings, all was changed.

Luke has a grudge at the Twelve; he seeks to depreciate them: such is the thesis which Baur has maintained, and which has made way in France. He proves it by 8 : 53, 54, where he contrives to make Luke say that *the disciples* laughed our Lord to scorn, and that He drove them from the apartment; and yet the words, "knowing that she was dead," clearly prove that the persons here spoken of were those who had witnessed the death of the young girl; and ver. 51 excludes the view that He put the disciples out, for He had just brought them within the house (see the exegesis). He proves it further by 9 : 32, where Luke says that Peter and the other two disciples were heavy with sleep; as if this remark were not intended to take off from the strangeness of Peter's saying which follows, and which is mentioned by the three evangelists. But the chief proof discovered by Baur of this hostile intention to the Twelve is his account of the sending of the seventy disciples, and the way in which Luke applies to this mission a considerable part of the instructions given to the Twelve in Matt. 10. But if the sending of the seventy disciples were an invention of Luke, after thus bringing them on the scene, he would make them play a part in the sequel of the Gospel history, and especially in the first Christian missions related in the Acts, while from that moment he says not a word more about them; the Twelve remain after, as well as before that mission, the only important persons; it is to them that Jesus gives the command to preach to the Gentiles (24 : 45 *et seq.*); it is from them that everything proceeds in the book of Acts; and when Philip and Stephen come on the scene, Luke does not designate them, as it would have been so easy for him to do, as having belonged to the number of the seventy. Keim himself acknowledges (p. 76) "that it is impossible to ascribe the invention of this history to Luke;" and in proof of this he alleges the truly Jewish spirit of the saying

with which Jesus receives the seventy on their return. So little was it suspected in the earliest times, even within the bosom of Judeo-Christian communities, that this narrative could be a Pauline invention, that it is frequently quoted in the "Clementine Homilies." If, in narrating the sending of the Twelve, Luke did not quote all the instructions given by Matthew (chap. 10), the same omission takes place in Mark, who cannot, however, be suspected of any anti-apostolic tendency; this harmony proves that the omission is due to the sources of the two writers.

If Luke had the intention of depreciating the Twelve, would he alone describe the solemn act of their election? Would he place it at the close of a whole night of prayer (chap. 6)? Would he mention the glorious promise of Jesus to make the apostles sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel? Would he omit the assent which they all give in Matthew and Mark to the presumptuous declaration of Peter: *I am ready to go with Thee even unto death?* Would he make no mention of their shameful flight at Gethsemane, which is related by the other two? Would he excuse their sleeping on that last evening by saying that they were sleeping *for sorrow;* and their unbelief on the day of resurrection, by saying that it was *for joy* they could not believe (those details are peculiar to Luke)? Luke does not speak of the ambitious request of Zebedee's two sons, and of the altercation which ensued with the other disciples; he applies to the relation between the Jews and Gentiles that severe warning, the first part of which is addressed in Matthew to the Twelve: "and there are first which shall be last," and the second part of which: "and there are last which shall be first," might so easily have been turned to the honor of Paul. If there is one of the synoptics who holds up to view the misunderstandings and moral defects of the apostles, and the frequent displeasure of Jesus with them, it is Mark, and not Luke.

In respect to Peter, who it is alleged is peculiarly the object of Luke's antipathy, this evangelist certainly omits the saying so honoring to this apostle: "Thou art Peter," etc., as well as the narrative, Matt. 14 : 28–31, in which Peter is privileged to walk on the waters by the side of our Lord. But he also omits in the former case that terrible rebuke which immediately follows: "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me." And what is the entire omission of this whole scene, compared with the conduct of Mark, who omits the first part favorable to Peter, and relates in detail the second, where he is so sternly reprimanded! If it was honoring to Peter to walk on the waters, it was not very much so to sink the next moment, and to bring down on himself the apostrophe: "O thou of little faith!" The omission of this incident has therefore nothing suspicious about it. Is not the history of Peter's call related in Luke (chap. 5) in a way still more glorious for him than in Matthew and Mark? Is he not presented, from beginning to end of this narrative, as the principal person, in a sense the only one (vers. 4, 10)? Is it not he again who, in the first days of Jesus' ministry at Capernaum, plays the essential part (Luke 4 : 38–44?) On the eve of the death of Jesus, is it not he who is honored, along with John, with the mission of making ready the Passover, and that in Luke only? Is not his denial related in Luke with much more reserve than in Matthew, where the imprecations of Peter upon himself are expressly mentioned? Is it not in Luke that Jesus declares that He has devoted to Peter a special prayer, and expects from him the strengthening of all the other disciples (22 : 32)? Is he not the first of the apostles to whom, according to Luke (23 : 34) as according to Paul (1 Cor. 15), the risen Jesus appears? And despite all this, men dare to represent the third Gospel as a satire directed against the

Twelve, and against Peter in particular (the anonymous Saxon);* and M. Burnouf ventures to characterize it thus in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (December, 1865): "Luke seeks to attenuate the authority of the Twelve . . . ; he depreciates Peter; he takes from the Twelve the merit of having founded the religion of Christ, by adding to them seventy envoys whose mission is contrary to the most authoritative Israelitish usages." M. Burnouf forgets to tell us what those usages are, and whether Jesus held Himself always strictly bound to Jewish usages. On the other hand, Zeller, the pronounced disciple of Baur, finds himself obliged to make this confession ("Apostelgesch." p. 450): "We cannot suppose in the case of Luke any real hostility to the Twelve, because he mentions circumstances omitted by Matthew himself which exalt them, and because he omits others which are to their discredit."

Once more, in what is called the Jewish tendency of Luke, there is a point which has engaged the attention of criticism: we mean the partiality expressed by this Gospel for the poorer classes, its *Ebionism* (strictly so called)!† "Luke's heresy," as De Wette has it. It appears 1 : 53, 6 : 20, 21, where the poor appear to be saved, the rich condemned, *as such;* 12 : 33, 34; 16 : 9, 23–25; 18 : 22–25, where salvation is connected with almsgiving and the sacrifice of earthly goods, damnation with the keeping of them. But, 1. We have seen that there is a temporary side in these precepts; see especially on 12 : 33, 34; 18 : 22–25. Does not Paul also (1 Cor. 7) recommend to Christians not to possess, but "*to possess* as though they possessed not?" 2. Poverty and riches by no means produce those effects inevitably and without the concurrence of the will. Poverty does not save; it prepares for salvation by producing lowliness: wealth does not condemn; it may lead to damnation, by hardening the heart and producing forgetfulness of God and His law: such is the meaning of 6 : 21–25 when rightly understood: of 16 : 29–31; of 18 : 27 (the salvation of the rich impossible with men, but *possible with God*); finally, of Acts 5 : 4, where the right of property in the case of Ananias and Sapphira is expressly reserved by Peter, and their punishment founded solely on their falsehood. 3. The alleged "heresy of Luke" is also that of Matthew and Mark (narrative of the rich young man), and consequently of our Lord Himself. Let us rather recognize that he giving up of property appears in the teaching of Jesus, either as a measure arising from the necessity imposed on His disciples of accompanying Him outwardly, or as a voluntary and optional offering of charity, applicable to all times.

If now, setting aside critical discussion, we seek positively to characterize the religious complexion of Luke's narrative, the fundamental tone appears to us to be, as Lange says ("Leben Jesu," i. p. 258 *et seq.*): "the revelation of divine mercy," or, better still, according to Paul's literal expression (Tit. 3 : 4): *the manifestation of divine philanthropy.*

To this characteristic there is a second corresponding one: Luke loves to exhibit in the human soul, in the very midst of its fallen state, the presence of some ray of the divine image. He speaks of that *honest and good heart*, which receives the seed of the gospel as soon as it is scattered on it; he points to the good Samaritan performing instinctively *the things contained in the law* (Rom. 2 : 14); in the case of

* Zeller himself says ("Apostelgesch." p. 436): "In reality, there are not to be found in this Gospel any of the indirect attacks, insults, malevolent insinuations, and sarcasms against Judeo-Christianity and the Judeo-Christian apostles which the anonymous Saxon seeks in it."

† It is well known that this term arises from a Hebrew word signifying *poor*.

Zaccheus he indicates the manifestation of natural probity and beneficence, as he will do in the book of Acts, in respect to Cornelius and several others, especially some of the Roman magistrates with whom Paul has to do. Therein we recognize the Greek ideal of the καλὸς κἀγαθός.

With the first of those two characteristics there is undoubtedly connected that universalism of grace so often pointed out in Luke; with the second, perhaps, the essential character which he unfolds in the person of Christ: humanity working out in Him its pure and normal development; the child, the young man growing in grace and wisdom as He grows in stature; the man comes out in His emotion at the sight of a mother bereaved of her son, of His native country on the eve of ruin, of His executioners who are striking themselves while they strike Him, of a thief who humbles himself. We understand the whole: it is *the Son of man*, born an infant, but through all the stages of life and death *becoming* the High Priest of His brethren, whom He leaves in the act of blessing them. So that this history is summed up in two features: divine compassion stooping down to man; human aspirations entering into perfect union with God in the person of Him who is to bring back all others to God.

With such a history before us, what narrow unworthy particularistic tendency could possibly exist in the writer who understood and worked upon it? Such an object imposes objectivity on the historian.*

III.—*Literary Point of View.*

A. The first feature which distinguishes Luke's work in this respect is the presence of a *prologue*, written in a Greek style of perfect purity, and in which the author gives account of the origin of his book. We have already shown (p. 33) what is the necessary inference from this fact, which has no analogy either in Matthew or Mark, or even in John, and which would suffice to demonstrate the Hellenic origin of the author, and the high degree of classical culture which prevailed in the circle, with a view to which he wrote.

B. The chief question which has been raised in regard to the literary character of Luke's composition is whether it belongs to the class of *collectanea*, simple compilations, or whether in all its details it observes a consecutive *plan*. It is well known that Schleiermacher took the first view. Our Gospel is in his eyes an aggregate of pieces separately composed and put together by a later compiler. In Ewald's opinion also the author is only a collector. Holtzmann himself (article on the Acts, in the "Bible Dictionary" published by Schenkel) calls our Gospel "a compilation without any well-defined plan;" he extends the same judgment to the Acts. This opinion is combated by several critics. Hilgenfeld speaks of "the artistic unity" of Luke's narrative. Zeller acknowledges "that a rigorous plan prevails throughout the entire

* This conclusion is admitted by two of the most distinguished representatives of modern criticism. Holtzmann (p. 401): "Just as the most ancient demonstrable Gospel document, the "Logia," was written without the least regard to any dogmatic interest . . . so the third Gospel, the most extensive work of the synoptic literature, betrays the tendency of its author only in its arrangement and choice of materials, and in slight modifications which bear only on the form of delineation" Reuss. (sec. 209): "We shall be nearer the truth if we assert that it was in no party interest, but by means of a disinterested historical investigation, that the materials of this narrative were collected."

work" (Gospel and Acts). M. Rénan sees in it "a work written throughout by the same hand, and with the most perfect unity." We adhere fully to this second view. We have already pointed out that one single idea inspires the whole narrative, and has determined the choice of its materials, namely, that of the development of the Christian work (1 : 1), from the twofold standpoint of its organic growth and of its breach with the Israelitish people. Once in possession of this idea, we easily comprehend the course of the narrative. The first two chapters of the Gospel are an introduction, in which Luke gives the preparation for the new work in that pure Being placed by God in the bosom of humanity. The work itself begins with the baptism of Jesus in chap. 3. It comprises three parts : 1. The Galilean ministry ; Jesus draws to Him the elements of His future Church, and lays down in the apostolate the principle of its organization. 2. The journey from Galilee to Judea ; this is a transition period : the work extends outwardly while it is strengthened spiritually ; but the hostility of the official representatives of the nation, the scribes and Pharisees, lighted up already in the previous period, goes on increasing. 3. The sojourn at Jerusalem : the cross violently breaks the last link between Israel and its King. But the resurrection and ascension, freeing Jesus from every national relation, and raising Him to a free and glorious existence, suited to the nature of the Son of God (Rom. 1 : 3, 4), make Him in the words of Peter, *the Lord of all* (Acts 10 : 36). The Israelitish Messiah by birth, He becomes by His death and ascension the King of the universe. From that time forth His people is the human race. The ascension, which forms the climax of the Gospel history, is at the same time the starting-point for the history of the Acts. "On the one side we ascend to this summit ; on the other we descend from it."* Hence the double narration of the fact. It belongs, indeed, to both writings—to the one as its crown, to the other as its basis. This repetition does not arise, as a superficial criticism supposes, from the juxtaposition of two different traditions regarding that event.† What sensible writer would adopt such a course? The ascension is the bond which joins together the two aspects of the divine work—that in which Jesus rises from the manger to the throne, and that in which, from the throne on high, He acts upon humanity, creating, preserving, and extending the Church. It forms part of the history of Jesus and of that of the Church.

Between the work which is wrought in Jesus and that wrought in the Church, and which is described in Acts, there is a correspondence which is exhibited by the parallelism of plan in the two books. After an introduction which describes the community of believers as already formed, though yet unknown (Acts 1, comp. with Luke 1 and 2), Pentecost introduces it on the theatre of history, as His baptism called Jesus to His public activity. 1. Here begins, chap. 2, the first part of the narrative, which extends to the end of chap. 5 ; it relates, first, the founding of the church of Jerusalem, the mother and model of all others ; then the obstinate resistance which the preaching of the apostles met with from the Jewish authorities and the mass of the nation. 2. The second part, perhaps the most remarkable in many respects, delineates, like the second part of the Gospel, a transition period. It extends to the end of chap. 12. The author has collected and enumerated in this piece the whole series of providential

* M. Félix Bovet.

† Any more than in the case of the double narrative of the creation of man in Genesis (chaps. 1 and 2). Man is described, chap. 1, as the goal of the development of nature ; chap. 2, as the basis of the development of history. Nature rises to him : history goes forth from him.

events by which the way was paved for transferring the kingdom of God from the Jews to the Gentiles, the subject of the third part. First, there is the ministry of Stephen, who dies for having said "that Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy the temple, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered" (6 : 14). There is the ministry of Philip (chap. 8), who makes the first breach on the Gentile world by the conversion of the Samaritans, in which Peter and John themselves come to take part. There is, by the hand of the same Philip, the baptism of a man who was doubly excluded from the ancient covenant as a Gentile and as a eunuch (Deut. 23 : 1). There is the conversion of Saul, who is to be the principal instrument of the work about to begin, the persecutor but the successor of Stephen. There is through the ministry of Peter the baptism of the Gentile Cornelius and his family, in consequence of the vision by which God taught that apostle that the wall of separation raised by the law between Israel and the Gentiles was thenceforth broken down. There is, as an effect of the dispersion of the church of Jerusalem, the foundation of the church of Antioch, the first church of heathendom, the point from which Paul will take his course to the heathen world, his permanent basis of operations, the Jerusalem of the Gentile world. Those six events, apparently accidental, but all converging to the same end, are chosen and grouped by the author with incomparable skill, to show, as it were, to the eye the ways in which the divine wisdom prepared for the approaching work, the conversion of heathendom. Chap. 12 concludes this part. It relates the martyrdom of James, the attempted martyrdom of Peter, and the sudden death of their persecutor, the last great representative of the Jewish nation, Herod Agrippa—persecuting Israel struck dead in the person of its last monarch. 3. The third part relates the foundation of the Church among the Gentiles by St. Paul's three journeys. His imprisonment at Jerusalem at the close of those three missionary tours, and the surrounding circumstances, form a sort of counterpart to the story of the Passion in the Gospel. It is the last act in the rejection of the Gospel by Israel, to which the conduct of the elders of the Roman synagogue toward Paul (chap. 28) puts the finishing stroke. What could be grander or clearer than this plan? We have yet to wait for a history of the Reformation, giving us, within the space of a hundred pages, as complete and precise a view of that great religious revolution as that which Luke has left us in the Acts, of the yet profounder revolution by which God transferred His kingdom from the Jews to the Gentiles.

C. If the plan of Luke is admirable from the controlling unity to which he subordinates so great a variety of materials, the style of the Gospel and of the Acts presents a similar phenomenon. On the one hand it is a striking medley. To the prologue of classic Greek, classic both in construction and vocabulary, there succeed narratives of the infancy, written in a style which is rather a *décalque** from the Aramaic than true Greek. It is quite clear that the author, after writing the prologue in his own style, here uses an Aramaic document or a translation from the Aramaic. We shall not repeat the proofs of this fact which we have given in our exegesis; in a measure they extend to the whole Gospel. As to the question whether it is Luke himself who has translated it into Greek, or whether he used a record already translated, we shall answer it immediately. For the present, we repeat that the proof which Bleek finds to support the second view in the expression ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους, i. 78,

* The name for the copy of a picture traced on transparent paper placed over the original.—Tr.

is without the least value (see the exegesis). Finally, besides the prologue written in pure Greek, and the parts which follow, all saturated with Aramaisms, we find other parts, such as chap. 14 : 7-15 : 32, 22, 23, the Hebrew coloring of which is much less pronounced, and which presented nothing or almost nothing offensive to Greek ears. It is not probable that they proceed from an Aramaic document, any more than that Luke composed them freely. In the first case they would contain more Hebraisms ; in the second, they would be still more completely free from them. It is therefore probable that those passages were composed in Greek by Luke or his predecessor, not from an Aramaic document, but from an oral tradition in that language.

The same variety of style reappears in the Acts. The first parts of this book betray an Aramaic source in every line. This character gradually disappears, and the last parts of the book, in which the author relates the scenes in which he seems to have been personally present, are written in as pure Greek as the prologue of the Gospel.

On the other hand, and notwithstanding this medley, the style of Luke has in many respects the seal of a well-marked unity. Not only is his vocabulary everywhere more extensive than that of the other evangelists, as might be expected from a writer familiar with classic Greek ; for example, he displays in a far higher degree the facility with which the Greek language indefinitely multiplies its stock of verbs, by compounding the simple ones with prepositions and otherwise ; but he has also certain expressions which exclusively belong to him, or which he uses with marked predilection, and which are scattered uniformly over all parts of his two writings, even those which are most evidently translated from the Aramaic. And this is the proof that Luke in those pieces did not make use of a translation already made, but was himself the translator.*

There are also certain correspondences alleged in vocabulary and syntax between Luke's style and that of Paul. Holtzmann enumerates about 200 expressions or phrases common to those two authors, and more or less foreign to all the other N. T. writers. † The anonymous Saxon has taken advantage of this fact in support of his hypothesis, according to which Paul himself was the author of the third Gospel. But this proof is far from satisfactory ; the phenomenon is explained, on the one hand, by the fact that Paul and Luke are the only two writers of the N. T. who were educated amid classical surroundings ; on the other, by the personal relations which they kept up so long with one another ; at least, if we are to trust the tradition which ascribes the Gospel to Luke (see chap. ii. of this Conclusion).

The study which we have now made of the distinctive characteristics of Luke's Gospel supplies us with the necessary data for reaching the conclusions for which we have to inquire regarding the origin of this composition.

* Zeller has devoted two profound essays to this element exclusively belonging to Luke in his two narratives, the one in the "Theol. Jahrb." 1843, p. 467 *et seq.*, the other in his "Apostelgesch." p. 390 *et seq.* He enumerates 139 expressions used preferentially, and 134 terms and phrases used exclusively, or almost exclusively, by Luke in the two works. The following are examples selected at random : *συμβάλλειν, περιλάμπειν*, and others like them ; *ἀνέλ ηψις, ὁ ὕψιστος, ἐμφοβος, ἐντρομος, παραχρῆμα, ἐξῆς, καθεξῆς, ἐνώπιον*, etc. ; *καὶ αὐτός, δὲ καί* (gradation), *τοῦτο ὅτι, τί ὅτι, τό* before a proposition which serves as a substantive, *καθότι, μὲν οὖν, καὶ γάρ, ἰδοὺ γάρ, ἐλεγε δέ* (in the sense so often pointed out in our commentary), *ἐπ' ἀληθείας, ἐξ ἧς ἡμέρας, κατὰ ἔθος* or *τὸ εἰωθός*, or *τὸ εἰθισμένον*, etc.

† For example : *ἀνθ' ὧν, ἀλλ' οὐδέ, ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι, ἐκκακεῖν, παράδεισος, ἀσώτως, ἀνταπόδομα, αἰνεῖν τὸν θεόν, ἀτενίζειν, διαγγέλλειν, ἀπελπίζειν*, etc.

CHAPTER II.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE THIRD GOSPEL.

We have before us in this chapter the four following points: The *aim* of the Gospel, the *time* of its composition, the *author* to whom it is to be ascribed, the *place* where he composed it.

I.—*The Aim.*

The common aim of our Gospels is to produce faith in Him whom they describe as the Saviour of the world. But each of them pursues this aim in a particular way: Matthew, by bringing the history of our Lord into connection with the Messianic prophecies of which it is the fulfilment; Mark, by seeking to reproduce the unique splendor which rayed forth from His person; John, by relating the most salient testimonies and facts which led His disciples to recognize and adore Him as the Son of God. What is the means by which Luke wishes to gain the same end?

It was thought enough, even down to our own day, to answer that he had sought to trace the Gospel history as faithfully as possible with a view to believers among the Gentiles.* This solution is not precise enough for the authors of the critical school, which seeks party tendencies everywhere in our sacred writings. By combining with the study of the Gospel that of the Acts, the objects of which seemed more pronounced, they have come to the conclusion that the writings of Luke are nothing else than a disguised defence of the person and preaching of Paul, in opposition to the persons and teaching of the Twelve; a history more or less fictitious intended to gain favor for that apostle with the Judeo-Christian party, which, down to the second century, remained obstinately hostile to him. Zeller, in particular, has developed this thesis in a work which might be called classic, if erudition and sagacity could stand for justice and impartiality.† MM. Reuss (§ 210) and Nicolas (p. 268) also ascribe to the Acts the aim of reconciling the Judeo-Christian and Pauline parties, but without accusing the author of wilfully altering the facts.‡

It must indeed be confessed, especially if we take account of the narrative of the Acts, that it is very difficult to believe that in writing this history the author had only the general intention of giving as complete and faithful a view of the facts as possible. A more particular aim seems to show itself in the choice of the materials which he uses, as well as in the numerous omissions which he makes. Whence comes it that, of all the apostles, Peter and Paul are the only ones brought on the scene? How are we to explain the marvellous parallelism between them established by the narrative? Whence the predilection of the author for everything relating to the person of

* So Origen (Eus. H. E. vi. 25), Eichhorn, Schleiermacher, De Wette, Bleek, stop short at this general definition. From this point of view, the Acts are simply regarded as a history of the apostolic age or of the first missions.

† Zeller (p. 363) calls the book of Acts "a treaty of peace proposed to the Judeo-Christians by a Paulinist, who wishes to purchase from them the acknowledgment of Gentile Christianity by a series of concessions made to Judaism."

‡ M. Nicolas thus expresses the aim of the Acts: "To extinguish the discussions of the two parties, and lead them to forget their old feuds by showing them that their founders . . . had labored with a full understanding with one another for the propagation of Christianity.

the latter ; the thrice repeated narrative of his conversion, the detailed account of the varied phases of his trial, the peculiarly marked notice of his relations to the Roman magistrates ? Why relate in detail the founding of the churches of Greece, and not devote a line to that of so important a church as Alexandria (to which Paul remained a stranger) ? To what purpose the circumstantial recital of Paul's voyage to Rome ? And why does the account of his arrival close the book so abruptly ? Is not Overbeck right in saying that, in reality, " the subject of the book is not the gospel, but the gospel preached by Paul." Even the first part, that which relates to Peter, seems to be only a preparation for the account of Paul's ministry. The author seems to say : Great as Peter was in his work in Israel, Paul was not one whit behind him in his among the Gentiles ; the extraordinary miracles and successes by which God accredited the former were repeated in no less a measure in the case of the other.*

We do not think that the recent defenders of the historical trustworthiness of the Gospel and the Acts (Mayerhoff, Baumgarten, Lekebusch) have succeeded altogether in parrying this blow. They have attempted to explain part of those facts, while admitting that the theme of the Acts was solely the propagation of the gospel from Jerusalem to Rome ; but this very demonstration breaks down at several points, and especially in the last chapter. For when Paul reaches this capital it is not he who brings the gospel to it ; rather it is the gospel which receives him there (28 : 15) ; and in what follows, the founding of a church at Rome by Paul is not related. As Overbeck says, " The Acts relate, not how the gospel, but how Paul, reached Rome."

While fully recognizing that the purely historical aim is unsatisfactory, it seems to us that that which Zeller proposes is inadmissible. Not only, as Bleek observes, must the coldly calculated deception, which would be inevitable in an author inventing a narrative with the view of forging history, appear absolutely improbable to every reader who gives himself up to the impression which so simple a composition produces ; but besides, how are we to set before our minds the result proposed to be gained in this way ? Did the author mean, asks Overbeck, to influence the Judeo-Christians to unite with Paul's party ? But in that case it was a most unskilful expedient to set before them the conduct of the Jewish nation in the odious light in which it appears throughout the entire history of the Acts, from the persecutions against the apostles in the first chapters, down to the dark plots in which the Sanhedrim itself does not shrink from taking part against the life of St. Paul. It must, then, be by acting on his own party, the Paulinists, that the author hoped to effect the fusion of the two camps. By presenting the picture of the harmony between Paul and the Twelve at Jerusalem (Acts 15), he proposed to bring the Paulinists of his time to concede to the Judeo-Christians, as Paul had formerly done to the apostles, the observance of the Mosaic rites. But the Judeo-Christians themselves of that period no longer held to this concession. It appears from the " Clementine Homilies" that circumcision was abandoned by this party. The author of the Acts, a zealous Paulinist, must then have asked his own to yield to their adversaries more than the latter themselves required ! Finally, what purpose, on Zeller's supposition, would be served by the entire transition part (chap. 6–12) ? This elaborate enumeration of the circum-

* It is known that Schneckenburger regarded this parallel between Peter and Paul as the principal thought and aim of the Acts (without thinking that the truth of the narrative was thereby compromised). It is only as a *curiosum* that we refer to the opinion of Aberlé, who regards the Acts as a memoir prepared with a view to Paul's defence in his trial before the imperial tribunal.

stances which went to pave the way for the free evangelization of the Gentile world might and should have its place in a truthful and sincere narrative of the progress of the Christian work ; it was a digression in a romance intended to raise Paul to the level of Peter. The modified form given by MM. Reuss and Nicolas to this conciliation-hypothesis has no force unless there is ascribed to the apostolic Judeo-Christianity and Paulinism a meaning and importance which, in our opinion, it never had (see chap. 4). What hypothesis does Overbeck substitute for that of Zeller, which he so well combats ? According to this critic, the author of the Acts does not think of reconciling the two camps. It is the Pauline party alone which, working on its own account, here attempts by the pen of one of its members " to come to an understanding with its past, its peculiar origin, and its first founder, Paul " (p. xxi.). Such, after so much beating about, is the last word of Baur's school on the aim of the writings of Luke. It is on the face of it a somewhat strange idea, that of a party composing a historical book to come to a clear understanding with its past. It is not, however, inconceivable. But if the author really means to come to an understanding about the beginnings of his party, it is because he knows those beginnings, and believes in them. The past is to him a definite quantity by which he measures the present. But in that case, how are we to explain the wilful falsifications of history in which, according to Overbeck himself, he indulged ? The miracles of St. Peter in the first part of the Acts are set down to the account of legend ; but those of Paul, in the second, were knowingly invented by the author. To restore the past at one's own caprice, is that to come to a clear understanding with it ? Much more, the author of the Acts, not content with peopling the night of the past with imaginary events, went the length of putting himself " into systematic opposition" (p. xxxvi.) to what Paul says of himself in his epistles. To contradict systematically, that is to say, knowingly, the best authenticated documents proceeding from the founder of the party—such is the way " to come to light regarding the person of that chief " ! The Tübingen criticism has entangled itself in a *cul de-sac* from which it cannot escape except by renouncing its first error, the opposition between the principles of Paul and those of the Twelve. We shall return to this question in our last chapter.

The perusal of the third Gospel is enough to convince any one that its author seriously pursues a historical aim. This appears from the numerous chronological, geographical, and other like notices of which his work is full (Quirinius, 2 : 2 ; the cycle of dates, 3 : 1 ; the age of Jesus, 5 : 23 ; the second-first Sabbath, 6 : 1 ; the details regarding the material support of Jesus and His apostles, 8 : 1–3 ; compare also 9 : 51, 13 : 22, 17 : 11, 21 : 37, 38, etc.). The narrative of the Acts is everywhere strewn with similar remarks (on Bethany, 1 : 12 ; expulsion of the Jews by Claudius, 18 : 2 ; Gallio, 5 : 12 ; the money value of the books burned, 19 : 19 ; the details of the disturbance at Ephesus, chap. 19 ; the fifty days between Passover and Pentecost, of which the narrative of the journey enables us to give an exact account, 20 . 6—21 : 16 ; the number of soldiers, cavalry and infantry, forming the escort, 23 : 23 ; the circumstantial account of the shipwreck, 27 ; the nationality and figure-head of the vessel which carries Paul to Rome, 28 · 11). The historical purpose of the narrative appears from the programme marked out in the prologue : to relate *all things, from the very first, in order, exactly* (1 : 3).

Yet it is certain, on the other hand, that no more than the other evangelists does the author relate history merely as history—that is to say, to interest the reader and satisfy his curiosity. He evidently proposes to himself a more exalted aim. The

tone of his narrative proves this, and he tells us so himself. He has before his eyes a reader who is already abreast of the essential points of the gospel verity, and whom he wishes to furnish with the means of confirming the reality of the object of his faith (*τὴν ἀσφάλειαν*). It is with this view that he presents him with a full, exact, and consecutive description of the life and ministry of Jesus Christ, "that he might [thus himself] verify the infallible certainty of those things wherein he has been instructed."

In what did those instructions received by Theophilus consist? According to St. Paul (1 Cor. 15 : 3–5), the essential points of elementary instruction were these two: Christ *dead for our sins, and risen the third day.* In Rome 10 : 6–10 the same apostle thus defines the object of faith, and the contents of the Christian profession: Christ descended for us into the abyss, and ascended for us to heaven; comp. also Rom. 4 : 23–25. Such is likewise the summary of Peter's preaching on the day of Pentecost.

Nevertheless, at the house of Cornelius (Acts 10), Peter already feels the need of preparing for the proclamation of those decisive saving truths by a rapid sketch of the ministry of Jesus. At Antioch of Pisidia (Acts 13 : 23, 24), Paul goes back, like Peter, even to the ministry of John the Baptist. For there is in the mind of every man, face to face with an important historical event, the felt need not merely to account for what it contains, but also for the way in which it has come about. And when the event has exercised, and continues ever to exercise, a deep influence on the lot of humanity, and on that of every individual, then the need of knowing its beginnings and development, its *genesis*, if I may so speak, takes forcible possession of every serious mind. And this desire is legitimate. The more value the event has, the more important is it for the conscience to defend itself from every illusion in regard to it. Such must have been the position of a large number of believing and cultured Greeks, of whom Theophilus was the representative. What mysteries must have appeared to such minds in those unheard of events which form the goal of gospel history: a man dying for the salvation of all other men; a Jew raised to the condition of the Son of God, and to power over all things; and that especially when those events were presented apart from their connection with those which had preceded and prepared for them, having all the appearance of abrupt manifestations from heaven! To how many objections must such doctrine have given rise? It is not without reason that St. Paul speaks of the cross as, *to the Greeks foolishness.* Was it not important to supply a point of support for such instructions, and in order to do that, to settle them on the solid basis of facts? To relate in detail the beginning and middle of this history, was not this to render the end of it more worthy of faith? In dealing with such men as Theophilus, there was an urgent necessity for supplying history as the basis of their catechetical training.

No one could understand better than St. Paul the need for such a work, and we should not be surprised though it were to him that the initiative was due. It is true there existed already a considerable number of accounts of the ministry of Jesus; but according to 1 : 3 (explained in contrast with vers. 1, 2), those works were only collections of anecdotes put together without connection and without criticism. Such compilations could not suffice to meet the want in question; there was needed a history properly so called, such as that which Luke announces in his programme. And if Paul among the helpers who surrounded him, had an evangelist distinguished for his gifts and culture—and we know from 2 Cor. 8 : 18, 19, that there was really one

of this description—how could he help casting his eyes on him, and encouraging him to undertake so excellent a work? Such is the task which Luke has discharged. It is neither by adducing the prophecies, nor by the personal greatness of Jesus, nor by his declarations respecting His heavenly origin, that the author of the third Gospel has sought to establish or strengthen the faith of his readers. It is by the consecutive exposition of that unique history whose final events have become the holy object of faith. The beginning explains the middle, and the middle the end; and from this illuminated close the light is reflected back on the events which have led to it. It is a well-compacted whole, in which the parts mutually support one another. Luke's Gospel is the only one which in this view presents us with the Gospel history. It is very truly, as it has been called, the Gospel of the *development* (M. Félix Bovet).

The heavenly exaltation of Jesus was, if one may so speak, the first stage in the march of Christian work. There was a second more advanced: the state of things which this work had reached at the time when the author wrote. The name of Christ preached throughout all the world, the Church founded in all the cities of the empire; such was the astounding spectacle which this great epoch presented. This result was not, like the life of Jesus, an object of faith to the Gentiles; it was a fact of felt experience. It required to be, not demonstrated, but explained, and in some respects justified. How had the Church been founded, and how had it grown so rapidly? How had it become open to the Gentiles? How were the people of Israel, from the midst of whom it had gone forth, themselves excluded from it? How reconcile with this unexpected event God's faithfulness to His promises? Could the work of Christianity really be under those strange conditions a divine work? All these were questions which might justly be raised in the minds of believers from among the Gentiles, as is proved by the passage 9–11 of the Epistle to the Romans, where Paul studies this very problem with a view to the wants of ancient Gentiles (11 : 13). Only, while Paul treats it from the standpoint of Christian speculation, and answers it by a *Theodicée*, the book of Acts labors to solve it historically. The first part of this book exhibits the Church *being born* by the power of the Spirit of the glorified Christ, but coming into collision at its first step with official Judaism. The second part exhibits God *preparing* for the new progress which this work was to make through the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles, and Israel at the same time shedding the blood of Stephen, and the King of Israel slaying or disposed to slay the two chief apostles—in a word, the rebellion of Israel in the Holy Land. The last part, finally, represents the divine work *embracing* the Gentile world, and the ministry of Paul crowned with a success and with wonders equal at least to those which had signalized the ministry of Peter—most certainly this parallelism, as Schneckenburger has observed, is before the mind of the author, while Judaism continues its opposition in every city of the pagan world where Paul preaches, and at length consummates that opposition in the very heart of the empire, in the capital of the world, by the conduct of the rulers of the Roman synagogue. Such is the end of the book. Is not the intention of such a writing clear? The narrative is a justification. But this justification is not, as has been unworthily thought, that of a man, St. Paul. The aim of the Acts is more exalted. By its simple and consecutive statement of events, this book purports to give the explanation and justification of the way in which that great religious revolution was carried through, which transferred the kingdom of God from the Jews to the Gentiles; it is the apology of the divine work, that of God Himself. God had left the Gentiles only for a time, *the times of ignorance;* He had tempo-

rarily *let them walk in their own ways* (Acts 17 : 30 ; 14 : 16). At the end of this time, Israel, first saved, was to become the instrument of universal salvation, the apostle of Christ to all nations. But this glorious calling which the apostles so often held out to it was obstinately rejected, and the kingdom of God, instead of being established by it, was forced to pass aside from it. It was therefore not God who broke with His people ; it was the people who broke with their God. Such is the fact which the book of Acts demonstrates historically. It is thus, in a way, the counterpart of Genesis. The latter relates how the transition took place from primitive universalism to theocratic particularism, through God's covenant with Abraham. The Acts relate how God returned from this temporary particularism to the conclusive universalism, which was ever His real thought. But while simply describing the fact, the Acts explain and justify the abnormal and unforeseen form in which it came about.

The end common to Luke's two writings is therefore to strengthen faith, by exhibiting the principle and phases of that renewal which his eye had just witnessed. Two great results had been successively effected before the eyes of his contemporaries. In the person of Jesus, the world had received a Saviour and Master ; this Saviour and Master had established His kingdom over humanity. The Gospel sets forth the first of those events ; the Acts the second. The Gospel has for its subject the invisible revolution, the substitution in the person of Jesus Himself of the dispensation of the Spirit for the reign of the letter, the transforming of the relations of God to man, salvation, the principle of that historical revolution which was to follow. The Acts narrate the external revolution, the preaching of salvation with its consequences, the acceptance of the Gentiles, and their substitution in the place of Israel. Salvation and the Church, such are the two works of God on which the author meant to shed the light of the divine mind. The Ascension linked them together. The goal of the one, it was the foundation of the other. Hence the narrative of the Ascension becomes the bond of the two writings. The aim of the work, thus understood, explains its beginning (the announcement of the forerunner's birth), its middle (the Ascension), and its end (Paul and the synagogue at Rome).

II.—*The Time of Composition.*

The very various opinions regarding the date of our Gospel (Introd. § 3) may be arranged in three groups. The first class fix it before the destruction of Jerusalem, between 60 and 70 ; the second, between the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the first century (Holtzmann, from 70 to 80 ; Keim, about 90) ; the third, Baur and his school, in the first part of the second century (Volkmar, about 100 ; Hilgenfeld, Zeller, from 100 to 110 ; Baur, after 130). The traditions which we have quoted (§ 3) and the facts which we have enumerated (§ 1) seem to us at once to set aside the dates of the third group, and to be unfavorable to the second. Tradition has preserved to us only one precise date, that given by Clement of Alexandria, when he places the composition of Luke before that of Mark, and fixes the latter at the period of Peter's sojourn at Rome—that is to say, in 64 (According to Wieseler), or between 64 and 67 (according to others). Following this view, our Gospel must have been composed between 60 and 67. The opinion of Irenæus is not, as is often said, opposed to this (§ 3). Let us examine the objections raised by criticism to this traditional date, which would place the composition of our Gospel antecedently to the destruction of Jerusalem.

1. The great number of gospel narratives already published before our Gospel, according to the prologue, presupposes a somewhat advanced period of the apostolic age.* But why might not numerous attempts at compiling traditions relative to the history of Jesus have been made during the first thirty years which followed events so great? "Though the art of writing had not yet existed, it would have been invented for such a subject," says Lange. When, especially, the generation of the immediate witnesses of the life of our Saviour began to be cleared away by death, and when the apostles, His official witnesses, left Palestine to go and preach to other nations, was it not inevitable that the gospel literature should appear to fill up this double void? Now it was about the year 60, at the latest, that those circumstances emerged.

2. The work of Luke betrays a certain amount of criticism, in regard to its sources, which leads to a date posterior to the destruction of Jerusalem. But from the time when the author had before him a certain number of works on the subject, it is evident that he could not compose his narrative without estimating those sources critically; that might be done at any period. All that was needed for it was leisure.

3. The influence of legend (Overbeck) is alleged in the writings of Luke, and a Paulinism already in a state of decadence (Reuss, so far as the Acts is concerned). But has the third Gospel presented to us a single description resembling that of the fire lighted in the Jordan at the time of the baptism, which Justin relates; or a single word which has any resemblance to the account of the marvellous vines of the millennial kingdom, in Papias; or a single scene amplified like that which is drawn by the Gospel of the Hebrews of the interview between Jesus and the rich young man (see on the passage)? Such are the traces of the influence of myth. Luke is entirely free from it. As to the weakening of the Pauline idea, we shall not be able to treat it thoroughly till chap. 4. We shall only say here, that so far from its being the fact that Luke gives us a Paulinism in a state of decline, it is Paul himself who, in the Acts, following the example of Jesus in the Gospel, agrees to realize Christian spirituality only in the restricted measure in which it is practicable. Fidelity to principle does not prevent men of God from exercising that prudence and charity which in practice can take account of a given situation.

4. The siege of Jerusalem is described in the prophecy of Jesus in so precise and detailed a form (19 : 43, 44; 21 : 20–24), in comparison with the compilations of Matthew and Mark, that it is impossible to assert that Luke's account is not subsequent to the event. Jesus predicted the destruction of Jerusalem, that is certain. The witnesses who accused Him of this before the Sanhedrim did not invent what was absolutely false, and Stephen rested his statement on some such prophecy (Acts 6 : 14). Now if Jesus predicted this catastrophe as a prophet, there is no reason why He should not have prophetically announced some details of it. But if He predicted it simply through the force of His political insight, He could not but be aware also that this destruction implied a siege, and that the siege could not take place without the means in use at the time (investment, trenches, etc.), and would be followed by all the well-known terrible consequences. Now nothing in the details given passes beyond the measure of those general indications.

5. The final advent of our Lord, it is further said, stands in Mark and Matthew in

* Keim: "Eine reiche Evangelien-Literatur zeigt den vorgerückten Blüthbestand des Christenthums."

immediate connection with the destruction of Jerusalem, while in Luke it is widely separated from it by the interval of the *times of the Gentiles* (21 : 24). In other passages, besides, the idea of the proximity of the Parousia is designedly effaced ; so 9 : 27, where Luke makes Jesus say that some of the disciples present shall see, not "the Son of man coming in His kingdom" (Matthew), but simply *the kingdom of God*. This all proves that, at the period when Luke was writing, experience had already led the Church to give up the idea that the return of Christ would immediately follow (εὐθέως in Matthew) the destruction of Jerusalem. We hold that the relation of immediate succession between the two events laid down by Matthew proves that his Gospel was composed before the destruction of Jerusalem ; but we cannot admit, what is held by the entire body almost of modern critics, that the interval supposed by Luke between those two events proves the date of his Gospel to be after that catastrophe. We have already treated several points bearing on this question in our exegesis (pp. 445, 446). The decisive question here is how Jesus Christ Himself spoke on the subject. We think we have given indubitable evidence, from a very large number of His sayings, that in His view His advent was to be separated by a considerable period, not only from the time that He was speaking, but from the destruction of Jerusalem, which, according to Him, was to happen during the lifetime of the contemporary generation. The bridegroom who delays his coming ; the porter who has to watch late or till midnight, or till cock-crow, or even till morning, waiting for his master ; the parable of the leaven, which exhibits the gospel slowly and by a process wholly from within transforming the relations of human life, that gospel which must be preached before His return throughout the whole world, while the apostles shall not even have had time to announce it to all the cities of Israel before the judgment of the nation, etc. etc.—all proves to us that Jesus Himself never confounded in one and the same catastrophe the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the present dispensation. Hence it follows, that if Jesus expressed His view on this subject, He must have spoken as Luke makes Him speak, and not as Matthew makes Him speak ; that consequently He must really have delivered two distinct discourses on those two subjects so entirely different in His eyes, and not one merely in which He blended the two events in a single description (Matt. 24). Now this is precisely what Luke says (see chap. 17, on the return of Christ, and chap. 21, on the destruction of Jerusalem). If it is so, with what right can it be alleged that Luke could not recover the historical truth on this point as he has succeeded in doing on so many others, and that his essentially more accurate account of the sayings of Jesus is produced only by a deliberate alteration of the documents which he had before him? What ! Luke returned by the path of error or falsehood to historical truth ! Really criticism here exacts more from sound sense than it can bear. Besides, it is psychologically impossible that Luke should have indulged in manipulating at pleasure the sayings of that Being on whom his faith was fixed, whom he regarded as the Son of God. Again, in this respect criticism ascribes a procedure to him which sound sense rejects. The sayings of our Lord may have been involuntarily modified by tradition, and have come to the evangelists in different and more or less altered forms ; but we cannot allow that they invented or changed them deliberately. In what results are we landed if we take the opposite view? It is asserted that some unknown poet put into the mouth of Jesus, about 68, the eschatological discourse, Matt. 24 ; then, ten or twenty years after the destruction of Jerusalem, Luke not less knowingly and deliberately transformed this discourse to meet the exigencies of the case ! But

we ask: if such were really the origin of our Lord's discourses, would they be what they are? Would their general harmony, and the points so often observed at which they fit into one another, be what they are, especially in our synoptics?

In opposition to those reasons, which appear to us to be of little weight, the following are the proofs which the book itself furnishes, to the fact of its being composed before the destruction of Jerusalem: 1. The aim which, as we have seen, explains the Gospel and the Acts, coincides thoroughly with that of the great epistles of St. Paul, especially of the Epistle to the Romans; besides, the correspondences in detail between the third Gospel and that letter are so many and striking, that it is almost impossible to deny that the two writings proceeded from the same surroundings and at the same period. For they are evidently intended to meet the same practical wants.* The main fact here is, that Luke resolves historically precisely the same problem of the rejection of Israel and the calling of the Gentiles which Paul treats speculatively in the important passage, Rom. 9–11.

2. The purity of the tradition, the freshness and simplicity of the narratives, and especially the appropriateness which Luke is able to restore to the sayings of Jesus, and which alone makes their full charm felt, do not admit of the view that this book was written at a considerable distance from the events, and that it was wholly outside the circle of the first witnesses. The destruction of Jerusalem had not yet burst over the Holy Land and scattered that Primitive Christian Society, when such information was collected as that to which we owe records so vivid and pure.

3. The book of Acts, certainly written after the Gospel, does not seem to have been composed after the destruction of Jerusalem. True, it has been alleged that 8:26 proves the contrary, but without the least foundation, as Overbeck acknowledges. The words: "Now it is desert," in this passage, refer not to the town of Gaza, but to the route pointed out by the angel, either to distinguish it from another more frequented way (Overbeck), or, as appears to us more natural, to explain the scene which is about to follow. How would it be possible for this writing, at least in its last lines, not to contain the least allusion to this catastrophe, nor even a word

* In the first two chapters of Luke, Jesus is described as the son of David by His descent from Mary, and as the Son of God by His supernatural birth; St. Paul begins the Epistle to the Romans with the words: "Made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God in virtue of the spirit of holiness." Luke's two writings, in their unity, demonstrate Israel's right of priority in regard to the kingdom of God; what else is this than the privilege of the πρῶτον, *first*, expressly attributed to the Jews by St. Paul, Rom. 1:16? Jesus, in Luke, is circumcised on the eighth day, and presented in the temple on the fortieth—two ceremonies which subject Him during His earthly life to the law; Paul, as if he were alluding to those facts related only by Luke, calls Jesus "a minister of the circumcision" (Rom. 15:8), and speaks of Him, Gal. 4:4, "made of a woman, made under the law." Luke, in the Acts, declares the universality of the divine revelation which preceded that of the Gospel: "God left not Himself without witness among the Gentiles;" Paul, Rom. 1:19, 20, likewise declares the revelation of the invisible God made to the Gentiles in the works of creation. Luke points to the Good Samaritan doing instinctively what neither the priest nor the Levite, though holders of the law, did; Paul, Rom. 2:14–15, 26–27, speaks of the Gentiles who do by nature the things contained in the law, and who thereby shall condemn the Jew, who hears, but at the same time breaks that law. Luke speaks of the times of ignorance, during which God suffered the nations to walk in their own ways; Paul, of the forbearance which God showed in regard to past sins, during the time of His long-suffering (Rom. 3:25) It would be tedious to prolong this parallel.

touching the death of St. Paul, which must have preceded it by a few years? We have already discussed this question (Introd. p. 8 *et seq.*). We shall sum up by saying that if, on the one hand, the mention of the term of two years, in the last verses of the Acts, clearly assumes that a new phase in Paul's life had begun after his captivity, on the other hand the complete silence of the author as to the end of the apostle's career proves that this phase had not yet terminated. The Acts must therefore have been written in the interval between the end of Paul's first captivity at Rome (in the spring of the year 64) and his martyrdom (about 67).* The Gospel must have been composed a short time before.

Again, it has been alleged that a considerable interval must have elapsed between the composition of those two writings; because the tradition followed by Luke in the Acts, in regard to the ascension, differs from that which dictated the account of the event in the Gospel, and consequently supposes new information. We have proved in our exegesis that this hypothesis is erroneous. The account in the Gospel is given summarily, with the view of presenting in the subsequent work a more complete view of the event.

4. We have explained in the Introduction, the influence which Luke exercised on the unauthentic † conclusion of Mark, by supposing that the first of those works appeared about the time when the composition of the second must have been interrupted (at the passage, Mark 16 : 8). We shall here take a step further. If it is true, as seems to be the consequence of the exegesis, that Luke was not acquainted either with the Gospel of Matthew or Mark, it follows that he wrote shortly after those two Gospels had appeared; otherwise he would not have failed to know works of such importance on the subject which he was treating. If therefore our exegetical result is established, we must conclude that the Gospel of Luke was composed almost simultaneously with the other two synoptics. We shall examine the premises of this conclusion more closely in chap. 3. Now, if it follows from the confounding of the two discourses on the destruction of Jerusalem and on the end of the world, in Matthew and Mark, that those writings are anterior to the first of those events, supposing that Luke did not know either the one or the other of them, he must share in this priority.

It seems to us on all these accounts that the composition of the Gospel and of the Acts must be placed between the years 64 and 67, as was indicated by tradition.

III.—*The Author.*

Here we start from a fact universally admitted, namely, the identity of the author of the Gospel and of the Acts. This is one of the few points on which criticism is unanimous. Holtzmann says (p. 374): "It must now be admitted as indisputable, that the author of the third Gospel is one and the same person with the author of the Acts." Indeed, the identity of the style, the correspondence of the plan, and the continuity of the narrative, do not admit of the least doubt in this respect, as Zeller also proves.

Who is this author? Tradition answers: Luke, Paul's fellow-laborer. If it goes

* The words of Paul, Acts 20 : 25, do not prove that the Acts were written after Paul's death, as has been alleged. For Luke does not make Paul, any more than Jesus, speak according to his own fancy.

† It is to be borne in mind that there is wide difference of view, according to the estimate of authorities regarding this portion. It may prove clearly authentic.—J. H.

so far as to ascribe to Paul himself a share in the composition, this is a later amplification which, as we have seen (Introd. p. 17), is foreign to the primitive statement.

No other objections are raised against the truth of this traditional assertion, than the arguments alleged to prove the composition of our two writings in the second century, a time at which there could no longer be a fellow-laborer of St. Paul. Those arguments having been refuted, it only remains to bring forward from those two writings the positive reasons to be alleged in support of the indication furnished by tradition :

1. It appears from the prologue that the author was not one of the apostles, but one of their *immediate disciples*, "a Christian of the second apostolic generation" (Rénan). This is implied in the words : "As they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses of these things."

2. This disciple was a Christian from among the Gentiles ; for, as Holtzmann observes, it is not probable that a Jewish Christian would have spoken of the elders *of the Jews* (7 : 3), of a city *of the Jews* (23 : 51), etc., etc.) The position of John, in whom we find similar expressions, was entirely different. In his case this form of expression is explained by reasons of a peculiar nature.)

3. This Greek Christian was a believer formed in the school of Paul. This is proved by that breath of broad universalism which inspires his two writings, and more particularly by the correspondence as to the institution of the Holy Supper in his account and Paul's.

4. He must even have been one of the apostle's fellow-laborers in the work of evangelization, at least if he is speaking of himself in the passages where the first person plural occurs in the book of Acts. And this explanation seems to be the only admissible one. If it is well founded, it further follows that the author cannot be one of the fellow laborers of Paul who are designated by name in the Acts, for he never speaks of himself except anonymously.

5. This apostolic helper must have been a man *of letters*. This is proved by the prologue prefixed to his work, the classic style of this piece, as well as of those passages of the Acts which he composed independently of any document (the last parts of the book) ; finally, by the refined and delicate complexion of mind and the historical talent which appear in his two writings.

Now all those features belong signally to Luke. We have seen (Introd. p. 11) : 1. Paul ranks Luke among the Christians of Greek origin. 2. He assigns him a distinguished place within the circle of his disciples and fellow-laborers. 3. The title physician which he gives him leads us to ascribe to him a scientific and literary culture probably superior to that of the other apostolic helpers.

Not only do the criteria indicated all apply to Luke, but they do not apply well to any other. Barnabas was of Jewish origin, for he was a Levite ; Silas also, for he belonged to the Primitive Church at Jerusalem. Timothy was a young Lycaonian, probably without culture, which explains the timid shrinking which seems to have characterized him as an evangelist (1 Cor. 16 : 10, 11 ; 2 Tim. 1 : 6–8). Besides, all these are designated by name in the Acts. Luke only (with the exception of Titus) never appears by name. We see that the evidences borrowed from Luke's writings harmonize with those furnished by the Epistles of Paul, and that both coincide with the traditional statement. Now, as it is not likely that the Primitive Church gave itself to the critical investigation which we have been making, this agreement between the critical result and the historical testimony raises the fact of the authorship of St. Luke to the highest degree of scientific certainty.

Moreover, all the authors whose judgment has not been perverted by the prejudices of the Tübingen criticism are at one respecting the person of the author. "It is impossible," says Holtzmann, "to understand why Luke should not be the author of this Gospel." "The author of this Gospel," says M. Rénan ("Vie de Jésus," p. 16), "is certainly the same as the author of the Acts of the Apostles. Now the author of the Acts is a companion of St. Paul, a title which perfectly applies to Luke." Keim thus expresses himself (p. 81): "There is no room to doubt that this writing was composed by the companion of Paul. At least it is incomprehensible how by pure conjecture a man should have been definitely singled out whose name so rarely appears in the epistles of the apostle."

IV.—*The Place of Composition.*

Some very uncertain traditions place the composition (as we have seen, Introd. § 3) at Alexandria (many MSS. Mnn.), in Greece (Beotia and Achaia, Jerome), or at Rome. A modern critic, Köstlin, has proposed Asia Minor.

We find little ground in the two writings for deciding between those different possibilities. The explanations appended to certain geographical names by no means prove, as some seem to think, that the author did not write in the country to which those localities belonged; they only prove that he did not suppose those localities known to Theophilus or to his readers in general. Thus it cannot be concluded, as has been attempted from the explanation respecting the city of Philippi (Acts 16 : 12), that he did not write in Macedonia; nor from those about Athens (17 : 21), that he did not write in Attica; nor from those about the Fair Havens and Phenice (27 : 8–12), that he did not write in Crete; and as little from explanations about localities in Palestine (Luke 1 : 26, 4 : 31, Nazareth, Capernaum, cities of Galilee; 8 : 26, the country of the Gadarenes, opposite Galilee; 23 : 51, Arimathea, a city of the Jews; 24 : 13, Emmaus, 60 furlongs from Jerusalem; Acts 1 : 12, the Mount of Olives, near Jerusalem), that he did not write in Palestine. What those passages prove is that he did not write for the Christians of Palestine or Macedonia, or Attica or Crete, at least exclusively. Because of the absence of similar explanations regarding certain Sicilian and Italian localities (Acts 28 : 12, Syracuse; ver. 13, Rhegium, Puteoli; ver. 15, Appii Forum and the Three Taverns), it does not necessarily follow that he wrote in Sicily, in Italy, or in Rome, but only that he knew those localities to be familiar to his readers. It must be confessed, however, that from the country of his readers we may draw an inference in regard to the place of composition; for it is natural to suppose that an author writes for the public with which he finds himself immediately surrounded.

The evidences which Zeller thinks he has discovered in favor of Rome as the place of composition either depend on his explanation of the aim of Luke's writings, which has been proved false, or are unsupported, for example, when he alleges the interest which the author shows for this city by making the foundation of the Roman church by Paul the culminating point of his narrative. Now the fact is, as we have proved, that this last chapter of the Acts has an altogether different bearing.

The reasons alleged by Köstlin and Overbeck in favor of Ephesus are not more conclusive. 1. It is asserted that Marcion, on his way from Asia Minor to Rome, brought thence Luke's Gospel. But by that time this writing was spread—this is proved by facts (Introd. § 1), as well as the other two synoptics—throughout all the churches. Marcion did not introduce it into western Christendom; he merely chose it among the received Gospels as the one which he could the most easily adapt to his

system. 2. The author of the Acts loves to describe the persons who afterward played a part in Asia Minor. But John, the chief personage of the church of Asia at the end of the first century, is wholly eclipsed in the Acts by Peter and Paul. 3. The Acts relate with predilection Paul's sojourn at Ephesus. True, but in such a way as to place in relief Peter's ministry at Jerusalem. Paul's sojourn at Ephesus was the culminating point of his apostolate, as the times which followed Pentecost were the apogee of Peter's.

Evidences so arbitrary cannot lay a foundation for any solid result. Once assured of the author's person, we should rather start from his history. Luke was at Rome with St. Paul from the spring of the year 62 (Acts 28); he was still there when the epistles were sent to the Colossians and Philemon. But when the apostle wrote to the Philippians, about the end of 63 or beginning of 64, he had already left Rome, for Paul sends no greeting from him to this church, so well known to Luke. When, therefore, the two years' captivity of the apostle spoken of in the Acts came to a close, and consequently that captivity itself, he was no longer with the apostle. Some years later, when Paul, imprisoned at Rome for the second time, sent from that city the Second Epistle to Timothy, Luke was again with him. Where did he reside in the interval? Probably in Greece, among those churches of Macedonia and Achaia, in whose service he had labored along with Paul, and in Achaia rather than Macedonia, seeing Paul does not salute him in the Epistle to the Philippians. Might it not then be at this period, and in this latter country, "in the countries of Achaia and Beotia," as Jerome says, that he composed his Gospel?* As to the Acts, he must have composed it somewhat later, probably at Rome beside Paul, shortly before his martyrdom in 67. The parchments which Paul asked Timothy to bring him from Asia, at the time when only Luke was with him, were perhaps documents which were to be used in this work; for example, the summaries of the admirable discourses at Antioch, Athens, and Miletus, which are like jewels set in the narrative of the Acts. The work was published when the head of the apostle fell under the sword. Hence the absence of all allusion to that event. The composition of the Acts, both in respect of place and date, would be nearly connected with that of the Epistle to the Hebrews, with which Luke's writings have several other features of agreement which are highly remarkable. †

* We went further in the development of this hypothesis in our first edition. We supposed Corinth, and even the house of Gaius, Paul's host in that city (Rom. 16 : 23), as the place of composition. M. G Meyer has rightly observed in his review, that in this case there was no reason to hinder Luke from taking textually from First Corinthians the account of the institution of the Holy Supper. We therefore withdraw those hypothetical details.

† As to the situation, the author of this epistle (we should say Luke, if the reasons in favor of Barnabas or Silas did not seem to us to preponderate) is about to set out from Italy with Timothy, just delivered from prison (after the martyrdom of Paul). For internal analogies compare the following passages :

Luke 1 : 2, ...	Heb. 2 : 3.
" 2 : 16, ...	" 1 : 6, 8, 10.
" 2 : 7, ...	" 2 : 14.
" 2 : 40, 52, ...	" 2 : 17, etc.

In Luke, the transformation of the Mosaic system into spiritual obedience.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the transformation of the Levitical *cultus* into a spiritual *cultus*.

In both, the idea of the human development of Jesus forming the foundation of the Christology.

CHAPTER III.

THE SOURCES OF LUKE, AND THE RELATION OF THE SYNOPTICS TO ONE ANOTHER.

We have reached the most arduous, but not the least important part of our task. This domain is that of hypothesis; but as it is from the most remote and inaccessible mountain regions that the rivers which fertilize and the torrents which devastate come down, so it is from the obscure regions into which we are about to enter that we get those widely various and yet influential criticisms on the value of the Gospel history, which find their way even to the people. We shall first take up what concerns the third Gospel in particular; then we shall extend our study to the other two synoptics. For those three writings are of a piece, and every definitive judgment on the one involves a result gained in regard to the other two.

I.—*The Sources of Luke.*

Two questions present themselves:

I. Is Luke dependent either on Matthew or Mark?

II. And if not, what were the true sources of this work?

I.

We have throughout the whole of our commentary exhibited, in the narrative and style, those characteristics which seem to us to demonstrate Luke's entire independence in respect of Mark and Matthew. It only remains to recapitulate those proofs, while we apply them to refute the contrary hypotheses.

A. As to Luke's independence *in relation to Matthew*, we shall not rest our conclusion on the numerous narratives which the first has more than the second. This fact would prove only one thing: that if Matthew served as a source to Luke, he was not the only one, at least unless we hold, with Baur, that Luke invented whatever he contains more than Matthew—an assertion which seems to us to be already sufficiently refuted. Neither shall we allege the many narratives of Matthew which are wanting in Luke; for we are aware of the reasons which might lead the follower to omit certain facts related by his predecessor. But we appeal to the following facts:

1. Luke's *plan* is entirely independent of that of Matthew; for it appears to us superfluous, after the investigations which we have just carried through, again to refute the opinion of Keim, according to which Luke's plan is no other than that of Matthew *spoiled*. What appears to us above all inconceivable, is that in the account of the journey (from 9 : 51) Luke should not even have mentioned Perea, which Matthew expressly makes the theatre of the corresponding journey (19 : 1). Especially at the point where Luke's narrative rejoins Matthew's (18 : 15, comp. with Matt. 19 : 13), one would expect such an indication without fail.

2. The *series of narrations* in Luke is wholly independent of that in Matthew. Two or three analogous groups like those of the baptism and temptation, of the two Sabbatic scenes (Luke 6 : 1 *et seq.* and parall.) of the aspirants to the kingdom of God (Luke 9 : 57 *et seq.* and parall.), and of the various scenes belonging to the Gadara excursion (Luke 8 : 22–56), etc., are easily explained by the moral or chronological connection of the events, in virtue of which they formed one whole in tradition. Be-

sides, these are not wanting features to prove, even in this respect, the independence of the two narratives. For example, the insertion of the accounts of the healing of the paralytic and of the calling of Matthew in Matthew's narrative of the Gadara excursion, and Luke's adding of a third aspirant unknown to Matthew.

3. In the narrative parts common to both, the independence of Luke in the *details of the accounts* is obvious at every word. The author who wrote Luke 1 : 2 could not have had before him Matt. 1 : 2, unless he had the formal intention of contradicting him. So Keim supposes that Luke had a Matthew before him which did *not yet* contain the accounts of the infancy! In the narrative of the temptation would Luke take the liberty of inverting the order of the temptations, and of omitting the appearance of the angels? Would he suppose the rite of the confession of sins in his description of John's baptism? In his account of the baptism would he modify the terms of the divine utterance? So in that of the transfiguration (see the exegesis). In the narrative of the calling of Matthew himself, would he change that apostle into an unknown person, named Levi? Would he expressly refer to another Sabbath the second Sabbatic scene (6 : 6) which Matthew places on the same day as the first (12 : 9)? Would he mention a single demoniac at Gadara, a single blind man at Jericho, in cases where Matthew mentions two? When borrowing the conversation at Cesarea Philippi from Matthew, would he omit to indicate the locality where it took place? Or would he introduce into the text of his predecessor such puerile changes as the substitution of *eight* days for *six*, in the narrative of the transfiguration, etc., etc.? We shall be told he used another source in those cases in which he had more confidence. This supposition, which we shall examine more closely, would solve some of those enigmas indifferently, but not all. In particular, the omissions of details remain unexplained.

4. In reporting the *sayings* of Jesus, not to speak here of the dislocation of the great discourses, how could Luke alter so seriously the terms of such a document as the Lord's Prayer, or of a declaration so grave as that regarding the blasphemy against the Spirit, etc., etc.; and then, on the other hand, indulge in such petty changes as the transformation of the sheep fallen into the pit into an ox, or of the two sparrows which are sold for a farthing into five which are sold for two farthings? How could he introduce into the middle of the Sermon on the Mount two sayings which seem to break its connection (6 : 39, 40), and which must be taken from two discourses, held in entirely different situations, according to Matt. (15 : 14, 10 : 25), where, besides, they have an altogether different application? Have we here again the fact of another document? But, in conclusion, to what purpose does he use Matthew? And would this preference for the other source go so far as to lead him to omit such sayings as these: "Come unto me . . ." which Matthew presented to him? For who could take in earnest the attempt to answer this proposed by Holtzmann (see pp. 310, 311)?

5. The chief reason for which it is thought necessary to regard Matthew as one of Luke's sources, is the identical expressions and parts of phrases which occur both in the discourses and in the parallel narratives. But whence comes it that this resemblance is, as M. Nicolas says, *intermittent*, and that not only in the same narrative, but in the same paragraph and in the same phrase? Did Luke slavishly copy Matthew for a quarter of a line, and then in the next quarter write independently of him? But this is child's play, if the sense is the same; it is still worse, if the change alters the sense. We know the answer which is again given here: he had not Mat-

thew only, but other documents as well before him ; he combines together those various texts. Behold our author, then, borrowing three words from one document, two from another, four from a third, and that in every phrase from beginning to end of his Gospel ? Who can admit the idea of such patchwork ? Need we here reproduce the well-known jest of Schleiermacher at Eichhorn's hypothesis (" Schr. d. Luk." p. 6)? Is it not enough to say, with Lange, " The process of death to explain the work of life?" No ; such mechanical inlaying could never have become that flowing simple, and limpid narrative which we admire in our Gospel. Let the parable of the sower be reperused in a synopsis, comparing the two texts, and it will be felt that to maintain that the first of those texts is derived from the other, in whole and in part, is not only to insult the good faith, but the good sense, of the second writer.

6. Weiss has pointed out that a number of Matthew's favorite expressions (*βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας, παρουσία, συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, σεληνιάζεσθαι, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ*, etc.) are completely foreign to Luke. If he had copied Matthew's text, how could one or other of those terms have failed now and again to escape from his pen ?

7. Luke's Gospel abounds in *Aramaizing* forms, not only in the passages peculiar to himself, but also in those to which Matthew has parallels. And, strange to say, those Aramaisms are wholly wanting in the text of the latter. We find, on the contrary, a pure, native, vigorous Greek. To suppose, therefore, that Matthew was Luke's principal source, is to believe that the latter, himself a Greek, and writing for Greeks, had arbitrarily foisted his foreign Aramaic phrases into the style of his predecessor. Who can imagine such an anomaly : the Hebrew writer writing good Greek for Hebrews, and the Greek writer cramming his Greek text with Aramaisms for Greeks ! *

B. Luke's independence *in relation to Mark* appears to us evident from the following facts :

1. Luke's plan is certainly not borrowed from Mark, who has no other plan than the known contrast between the Galilean ministry and the sojourn at Jerusalem, and whose narrative is composed, besides, of detached scenes. That which Klostermann discovers appears to us to be due rather to the critic than to the evangelist. The unity of Mark's work lies elsewhere ; it is found in the person of Jesus Himself, whose greatness forms the common basis of all those varied scenes, and in the impression of

* The phenomenon is found on the largest scale. Let the following parallels be compared :

Luke.	Matthew.
5 : 1 : *ἐγένετο . . . καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν . . . καὶ εἶδε.*	4 : 18 : *περιπατῶν δὲ εἶδε.*
5 : 12 ; 5 : 17, 18 : *καὶἐγένετο . . . καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν . . . καὶ ἦσαν . . .* ; 6 : 1.	8 : 1 ; 9 : 1, 2 ; 12 : 9.
8 : 22 : *καὶ ἐγένετο . . . καὶ αὐτός . . .*	8 : 18 : *ἰδὼν δὲ ἐκέλευσεν.*
9 : 18, 28, 37, 57.	16 : 13 ; 17 : 1, 14 ; 8 : 19.
11 : 14 ; 18 : 35 ; 19 : 29.	12 : 22 ; 20 : 29 ; 21 : 1.
24 : 4, 15, 30, 51.	
20 : 11 : *καὶ προσέθετο πέμψαι ἕτερον* (ver. 12) ; comp. 3 : 20.	21 : 36 : *πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν ἄλλους.*
20 : 21 : *λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον.*	22 : 16 : *εἰς πρόσωπον βλέπειν.*

Other Hebraistic forms in Luke: *σάββατον δευτεροπρῶτον*, 6 : 1 ; *μεγαλυνειν μετά*, 1 : 58 ; the *καὶ . . . καὶ . . .*; 24 : 23–35, etc.

admiration which it inspires. Therein there is nothing resembling the progressive development which comes to light in Luke's work.

2. No doubt as to the series of events, especially at the beginning, there is a greater agreement between Mark and Luke than between Luke and Matthew ; but not without transpositions much more difficult to explain, on the supposition that Mark was used by Luke, than is the analogy in some series, without any dependence on Luke's part.

3. There is in Luke a more important omission than that of some particular accounts ; there is the omission of the whole cycle, Mark 6 : 45-8 : 26 (Matt. 14 : 22-16 : 12). How is such a suppression conceivable, if Luke, who nevertheless aimed at being complete (*πᾶσιν*, 1 : 3), makes use of Mark ? It has been supposed that there was a gap in the copy of Mark which he possessed ; can this reply suffice ?

4. The same difference, besides, meets us in regard to the special details of the narratives, and in regard to the style of our Lord's discourses, as between Luke and Matthew. If Luke copies Mark, why does he put the healing of the blind man at Jericho at the departure of Jesus, while Mark puts it at His entrance ? Why does he omit the name of Bartimeus, and the picturesque details of Mark's description ? What purpose could it serve to mutilate at will such dramatic accounts as that of the healing of the lunatic son ? By what caprice substitute for the words of Mark : "Save a staff only," these apparently contradictory ones : "Nothing, not even a staff" ? And when Luke clearly places the expulsion of the buyers and sellers from the temple, on the morrow after Palm-day, why put it on that same day ? Does Luke make sport of history, and of the Master's words ?

5. Of the very many Hebraisms which we have pointed out in Luke, only a very few are found in Mark. Once more, then, Luke made the medley ! He, the author of Greek origin, who could write classic Greek, overloading his style with Hebraisms which he does not find in his model !

6. Finally, we call attention to the mixture of slavish dependence and affected originality which would characterize the text of Luke, if he really reproduced the text of Mark. Is not Gieseler right in saying : "And despite such affectation, this work bears a seal of simplicity and of the absence of pretence, which strikes every reader !" Another source has been spoken of as used besides Mark. So we are brought back to that manufacturing of phrases of which we have already spoken. The supposition has been given forth that Luke used the previous writing entirely from memory. But how could this memory be at once so tenacious as to reproduce the minutest expressions of the original text ; and, on the other hand, so treacherous as sometimes to alter the facts so seriously ? Here there would be an intermitting of memory more difficult still to explain than the intermittence of the style to support which this hypothesis is resorted to.

We conclude that neither Matthew nor Mark, in their present form at least, figured among the sources of Luke. Such, besides, is the conclusion which we might have drawn from his prologue. The manner in which he contrasts the *πολλοί* (*many*), compilers of previous writings, with the apostles and eye-witnesses of the events, forbids us to rank the Apostle Matthew among the former ; so that if he shared the received opinion which ascribed to Matthew the first Gospel, he cannot have ranked this book among the writings of which he speaks. It would certainly not be easier to maintain that, in a heap with so many ephemeral writings, he referred to such an important work as that of Mark, which from the first times the Church (witness Papias,

Clement, Irenæus) signalized and regarded as one of the most precious documents regarding the ministry of Jesus.

II.

Those two writings being set aside, what then are the sources from which Luke has drawn?

Criticism has sought to determine the sources of Luke, either from certain characteristics of his style, or from the religious tendencies of certain parts, or from the localities which form the scene of his narrative.

1. Proceeding from the first point of view, Schleiermacher, as is well known, broke up our Gospel into a certain number of detached narratives, which the hand of the compiler had combined in such a way as to form them into a consecutive history. The phrases of transition which we have indicated throughout our Gospel are in his eyes the conclusions of those short writings; they do not belong, according to him, to the general compiler. This hypothesis cannot be maintained: *a*. Because those forms have too much resemblance not to be from the same hand. Besides, they reappear in the narrative of the Acts. *b*. The unity of style and plan proves that the evangelist was not a mere collector. The author, no doubt, possessed written materials; but he used them in such a way as to work them into a homogeneous whole. As to the two accounts of journeys which Schleiermacher thinks have been amalgamated in one in the piece 9 : 51–19 : 27, see at p. 287.

2. We have already spoken of the great Judeo-Christian Gospel, in which Keim finds the substance of the greater part of Luke's Gospel. But as there is no necessity for regarding Luke's narrative as swayed by opposing religious currents, Keim's hypothesis falls to the ground with the fact on which it was based. According to Hilgenfeld, the author consulted a third document besides Matthew and Mark, that which is reproduced in a modified form in the journal (9 : 51–19 : 27). But if this piece formed one whole by itself, whence comes it that, at the point where Luke's account rejoins that of Matthew and Mark (18 : 15), we find not the least sign of the end of the interpolated piece? Hilgenfeld ascribes an altogether peculiar character to this piece—the austerity of the Christian life; and a special aim—to narrate the formation of a circle of disciples whose work, passing beyond the Jewish domain, was to form a prelude to that of Paul. But this aim enters into the progressive movement of the whole book, and the first characteristic referred to belongs to the entire teaching of Jesus (the rich young man).

3. Köstlin thinks he can maintain a source specially Judean for the events which are said to have passed in Judea, and for those of which Samaria was the theatre, or in which the Samaritan people play a part—a Samaritan source. Keim regards this latter, the basis of the account of the journey (9 : 51–18 : 27), as one and the same work with the document which furnishes the account given in the Acts of the conversion of a Samaritan population (Acts 8). As well might we speak of an Abyssinian source for the narrative of the noble belonging to the court of Candace, etc. As if it were necessary to bring local interest into the composition of such a history! For a similar reason, Bleek takes Galilee as the place of the composition of his original Gospel—the principal source of Matthew and Luke. The preponderance of the Galilean ministry, and the omission of the journeys to Jerusalem, in this fundamental writing, arise from a predilection of a local nature. This hypothesis is as unsatisfactory. The more elevated the sphere of a narrative is, the less probable is it that the place of

its origin determined its horizon. This is not the time to occupy ourselves with other alleged sources of Luke, to the supposition of which criticism has been led by the mysterious relation which unites our three synoptics, expressly the primitive Matthew (or Logia) and the proto-Mark. This question will occur when we come to study the relations between the synoptics.

For ourselves, the following is all that we conclude from our exegetical study: 1*st*. We have established a source of purely Jewish origin: the genealogical document 3 : 23 *et seq.* (see the exegesis). 2*d*. From 1 : 5 we have found ourselves face to face with an account of a wholly Judeo-Christian character, both in substance, seeing it renders with incomparable freshness the impressions of the first actors in the Gospel drama; and in form, for the style leaves no doubt as to the language in which it was written. This piece (chaps. 1 and 2), the Aramaic character of which Luke has preserved in Greek as faithfully as possible, may have been a detached account preserved in the family of Jesus, or have belonged to a more considerable whole, one of the works spoken of by Luke. The other parts of the Gospel, all of which, except the account of the Passion, betray an Aramaic basis, must have emanated also from the Judeo-Christian Church. We shall probably never know whether those pieces were taken from different writings or borrowed from one and the same work. 3*d*. The parts in which this Hebrew character is less perceptible, in matter and form, have probably been composed in Greek on the basis of oral narratives, public or private. Thus the account of the Passion, in which we shall find certain classical turns of expression (23 : 12, προϋπῆρχον; 5 : 15, ἐστὶ πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ; 5 : 18, παμπληθεί), if it is not the work of Luke himself, might be taken from one of the Gospels antecedent to Luke, composed in Greek. 4*th*. The narrative of the institution of the Holy Supper is certainly of Pauline origin; comp. 1 Cor. 11. Was this source written? Was it, perhaps, the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians? In this latter case, Luke must have quoted from memory, as seen from the differences between the two forms. Or was it purely oral? Luke, having often celebrated the Holy Supper with Paul (Acts 20), might have retained in his memory more or less literally the formula which the apostle used on those occasions. Such is all that we think can be advanced with any probability, proceeding upon the study of the Gospel.

II.—*The Relations and Origin of the Synoptics.*

We shall first examine the systems which are at present current; thereafter, we shall state our own view.

I.

A. Most critics are now agreed on this point, that *Matthew and Mark were not dependent on Luke*. No doubt, Bleek traces back Mark to Matthew *and Luke;* and, according to Volkmar, Matthew was borrowed *from Luke* and Mark. But those opinions do not enjoy anything like general acceptance. Bleek's most plausible argument is that which he derives from certain phrases of Mark, in which the text of the other two seems to be combined. But if Mark was such a close copyist as to place side by side two phrases identical in meaning, that he might not lose a word or part of a phrase belonging to the text of his predecessors, how, on the other hand, would he reject immense pieces from their works, or modify it in so serious a way as he often does? The phenomenon which has misled Bleek, and some others before him, arises

simply from that somewhat wordy style of amplification which characterizes Mark, and which appears throughout his whole narrative. As to Volkmar's opinion, it contradicts two obvious facts: the vigorous originality of Matthew's style, and the brevity of his narratives in comparison with Luke's. As an example, let the history of the centurion at Capernaum be taken, in which, for all the steps adopted by him to avoid approaching Jesus personally, and even to prevent His coming under his roof (in Luke), Matthew substitutes the words, "He came unto Him, beseeching Him;" or the history of the paralytic, in which Matthew would be made to borrow from Luke the words, "And seeing their faith," after having suppressed all the circumstances to which this expression refers! All this proves nothing, I know, to a man like Volkmar, who thinks that the evangelists manipulate their materials according to their caprice. How could the first evangelist have arbitrarily created his great discourses by means of the teachings of Jesus scattered throughout Luke? Such procedure is as inadmissible as the *dislocation* which others ascribe to Luke.

B. Luke being disposed of, the only possible question regarding the origin of Mark and Matthew is this, *Does the one depend on the other?* The general plan in both is very similar) the contrast between the Galilean ministry and the sojourn at Jerusalem). Between those two parts there is also found in both writings a very brief account of the journey through Perea. The order of the narratives is almost identical from the conversation at Cesarea Philippi; there are more considerable differences in the first part of the Galilean ministry, but the cause of them may be ascribed to the manner in which the Sermon on the Mount, omitted by Mark, is prefixed to it in Matthew. Finally, at every moment we meet with identical or similar phrases in both Gospels.

But, on the other hand, if *Mark used Matthew,* whence comes it that, besides those identical phrases, we have continual differences which, on the supposition of a text being before him, assume by their very insignficance an intolerable character of toying and affectation of originality? Whence come those differences in respect of matter, partly mutilations, partly amplifications, sometimes insoluble or apparent contradictions? As when Mark makes Jesus say, "Nothing, *save* sandals;" where Matthew says, "Take nothing, *not even* sandals." So when, in the narrative of the expulsion of the sellers from the temple, and in that of the barren fig-tree, Mark places those events on a different day from that on which they transpired according to Matthew. So in the account of the calling of Matthew, where Mark, on this supposition, substitutes for the person of the apostle an unknown personage named Levi, without making the slightest allusion to the name of Matthew, which the first Gospel gives to this publican; then, in the cures of the demoniac, and of the blind man of Jericho, in which Mark mentions only one sufferer instead of the two spoken of by his model? Klostermann's opinion, which makes Matthew's account the text on which Mark engrafted the descriptive glosses which he received from Peter, likewise falls to the ground before the difficulties mentioned.

Or was it *Matthew who used Mark?* But Matthew's method is wholly original and independent of Mark's. He loves to group homogeneous events round a prophetic text. This organic principle is in keeping with the fundamental view of his Gospel.*

* After a general prophecy, given as the basis of the entire narrative of the Galilean ministry (4 : 14–16), there follow: 1. The Sermon on the Mount; 2. A collection of deeds of power (chaps. 8 and 9), grouped round the prophecy of Isaiah, quoted 8 : 17; 3. The instructions to the Twelve, chap. 10; 4. A collection of the utterances

It has nothing in common with the order followed by Mark. Then, in most cases, we should be forced to think that he made it his business to spoil the narratives of his model; so in the cure of the paralytic, in that of the blind man of Jericho, and particularly in that of the lunatic son. Why, besides, omit the names of the four disciples in the conversation of Jesus with the apostles on the Mount of Olives (Mark 13)? Why, in relating the preparation for the Passover, say, He sent *His disciples*, as if it was all of them, while his predecessor expressly said, *two* of His disciples? Why omit in the prayer of Gethsemane those beautiful words preserved by Mark, "Father, all things are possible unto Thee," etc., etc.

In fine, it is impossible to conceive anything more capricious and less reverential than the part which we make the author of any one whatever of our synoptic Gospels play, with the history and sayings of Jesus, supposing that he had before him the other two, or one of them. Such an explanation will only be allowable when we are brought absolutely to despair of finding any other. And even then it were better still to say, *Non liquet.* For this explanation involves a moral contradiction. Most of our present critics are so well aware of this, that they have recourse to middle terms. By common sources they seek to explain the relation between those three writings, or they combine this mode with the preceding. We have already described in our introduction the numerous systems of this kind which are proposed at the present day.

C. Bleek derives Matthew and Luke *from a Greek Gospel, composed in Galilee.* This hypothesis appears to us as unfruitful as those which derive them from one another. Take, for example, the Lord's Prayer. A common text, whence the two evangelists derived the terms of this formulary which both have transmitted to us, is not less inconceivable than the deriving of one of those reports from the other, unless we ascribe to either of them an incredible degree of arbitrariness in regard to a most solemn utterance of the Master. And the same phenomenon reappears from beginning to end of our two Gospels! Besides, the prologue of Luke protests against Bleek's explanation. Luke speaks of *many* Gospel narratives which were in existence at the time when he wrote. Bleek's hypothesis supposes only one. To escape from his difficulty, this critic reduces the many writings of which Luke speaks to simple revisions of that original Gospel; but Luke evidently understood by those many writings not rehandlings of one and the same fundamental work, but different and independent compilations of apostolic tradition.

The hypothesis most in favor in these last times is one which, recognizing the originality of Mark, places him at the head of the Gospel historiography, so far at least as the narrative part is concerned, but in an older form: the so-called *proto-Mark, the common source of our three synoptics.* Moreover, a second source was used by Matthew and Luke: the *collection of discourses*, the *Logia* of Matthew. Holtzmann has developed this hypothesis in a work which is one of the finest fruits of critical research in our century. Let us examine those two hypotheses of the *Logia* and the *proto-Mark.*

That there existed a collection of discourses written by the Apostle Matthew, which was one of the oldest Gospel documents, we have not the least doubt. The ground of our conviction is not so much the testimony of Papias, of which Giesceler rightly

of wisdom (chaps. 11 and 12), grouped round the prophecy of Isaiah, quoted 12 : 17 ; 5. The parables of the kingdom, chap. 13 ; 6. A series of excursions to the east, north, and north-east, filling up the prophetic programme laid down as the basis of the Galilean ministry.

says : "Separated as this notice appears from its context, it is difficult to draw from it any certain conclusion ;" it is rather the form of our first Gospel itself in which we meet with great bodies of discourses distributed at certain points of the narrative, and which appear to have existed *as such* antecedently to the work in which they are inserted. It is difficult to avoid the impression that those bodies of discourses originally formed one whole. Weizsäcker has, with a master hand, as it appears to us, traced the plan of this original Matthew (pp. 184–186). The apostolic treatise opened with the Sermon on the Mount ; it was the invitation to enter into the kingdom, the foundation of the edifice. There followed as the second part of the collection, the discourses addressed to particular persons, such as the instructions given to the apostles (Matt. 10), the testimony regarding John the Baptist (Matt. 11), and the great apologetic discourse (Matt. 12). Finally, the eschatological prophecy (Matt. 24 : 25) constituted the third part ; it formed the climax of the collection, the delineation of the hopes of the Church. The other groups of instructions, the collection of parables (chap. 13), the discourse on the duties of the disciples to one another and on discipline (chap. 18), formed, according to Weizsäcker, an appendix corresponding to certain practical wants of the Church. We would introduce some modifications into this reconstruction of the *Logia* as proposed by Weizsäcker.* But this matters little to the question before us : the main thing is that such a work existed, and very nearly as conceived by Weizsäcker. Holtzmann thinks, on the contrary, that the sayings of Jesus rather appeared in the *Logia* in the form in which we find them in Luke's narrative of the journey (9 : 18) ; it was the author of our first Gospel, according to him, who grouped them into systematic discourses.

We shall begin by criticising this second view. 1. It seems to us impossible, as we have already remarked in opposition to Volkmar, that the author of a historical work, such as our canonical Matthew, took the liberty of gathering into certain large masses sayings uttered in different circumstances, to form so-called discourses of which he might say they were uttered by Jesus at this or that time. 2. Holtzmann's hypothesis is opposed by the unanimous conviction of the Church, which from the beginning has attached the name of Matthew to our first Gospel. According to this view it would really be the Gospel of Luke which had preserved the *Logia* in their true form, and which ought to have inherited the name of the Apostle Matthew. By attaching to our first gospel the name of Matthew, the Church has shown, on the contrary, that it was this work which was the depositary of the treasure bequeathed to the world by this apostle. 3. The strongest objection to the use of the *Logia* by our two evangelists is always, in our view, the wholly different terms in which the teachings of Jesus are conveyed in the two recensions. One *copies* discourses if he believes in them ; one *invents* them if he does not. The supposed middle way, three

* Instead of making the collection of the parables an appendix, we should make it the centre of the work. The *Logia* of Matthew, that collection intended to reproduce our Lord's teaching in its essential characteristics, opened, we should say, with the exposition of the *righteousness* of the kingdom of heaven, in the Sermon on the Mount. There followed the description of the *development* of that kingdom, in the collection of the parables (Matt. 13) ; finally, the great eschatological discourse, Matt. 24 and 25, announcing the *consummation* of the kingdom, was the cope-stone of the edifice. Between those principal parts there were placed, like passages between the apartments properly so called, certain subordinate instructions, such as the discourse on John the Baptist, on the casting out of devils, and on discipline in the Church (Matt. 11 : 12, and 18).

words of copy, three words of invention, seems to us an impossibility. No doubt it might be asserted that each author combined with the use of the common source (the "Logia") that of different particular sources. But what an impossible procedure is that which we thereby reach! Three words borrowed from the common source, three from one or other of the special sources, and this for the composition of *every* phrase! What a mosaic! What an amalgam!

Can we, on the other hand, adopt the opinion of Weizsäcker? Were the great discourses of the "Logia," as preserved intact by Matthew, the source at the same time of the teachings of Jesus, as reported by Luke? No. For: 1. We cannot admit that Luke at his own hand displaced those great discourses. 2. This supposition is rendered untenable by all the proofs which our exegesis has supplied of the truth of the historical prefaces which introduce the declarations reported by Luke. It would be impossible to conceive a procedure more recklessly arbitrary than that which Weizsäcker ascribes to this author, when he makes him invent situations for discourses, discourses which he began by carving out of the "Logia" at pleasure. 3. This arbitrariness would reach its height in the invention of the narrative of the journey, 9 : 51–18 : 27. This journey, according to this view, was out and out a fiction of the writer, intended to serve as a framework for all the materials which remained unused. What would be thought of a writer who should act in this way after having declared that he would seek to relate all things exactly and in order?

The work of the "Logia" then existed, and we think that it may be found entire in our first Gospel. But it is not thence that Luke has drawn our Lord's discourses. And this result is confirmed by Luke's own declaration, from which it appears that, among the gospel works which had preceded his own, he found none proceeding from an apostle.

In regard to the second source, that from which the materials of the *narrative* common to our three synoptics is said to have been derived, the proto-Mark, not only do we deny that our three synoptics can be explained by such a work, but we do not believe that it ever existed. 1 Eusebius, who knew the work of Papias, some lines of which have given rise to the hypothesis of an original Mark, distinct from ours, never suspected such a difference; so far as he was concerned, he had no hesitation in applying the testimony of Papias to our canonical Mark. 2. If there had existed a gospel treatise enjoying such authority that our first three evangelists took from it the framework and the essential materials of their narrative, Luke certainly could not, as he does in his prologue, put the writings anterior to his own in one and the same category, and place them all a degree lower than the narrative which he proposed to write. He must have mentioned in a special manner a document of such importance. 3. Neither the special plan of each of our synoptics, nor the transpositions of histories, nor the differences more or less considerable which appeared in the details of each narrative, can be satisfactorily explained on the supposition of this unique and common source. Compare only the three accounts of the baptism of Jesus, or of the blind man of Jericho (see the exegesis)! And as to the discourses, those at least which are derived from the proto-Mark, take a synopsis and attempt to explain the three texts by a common document, and the levity or puerility which must be ascribed now to the one and again to the other of our three evangelists, to make them draw from one and the same document, will be fully apparent! See, for example, the saying on the blasphemy of the Spirit (Luke 12 : 10 and parall.). In most cases Holtzmann enumerates the differences, and he images that he has ex-

plained them! 4. The decisive argument seems to us to be that which is founded on the style of the three gospels. As Weiss says, "A writing so harmoniously and vigorously composed as our first gospel cannot be an extract from another writing." In no case could it proceed from a writing the literary stamp of which had the least resemblance to that of Mark. And Luke? Once more, it would be he who had taken a fancy to introduce into the text of the proto-Mark those so pronounced Aramaisms which distinguish his gospel from the other two! From this proto-Mark from which Matthew derived good Greek for Hebrews, Luke took Hebraised Greek for Greeks! The proto-Mark is a hypothesis which cannot be substantiated either in point of fact or in point of right; for were there really such a writing, it would nevertheless be incapable of doing the service for criticism which it expects from it, that is, supply the solution of the enigma of the synoptics. Besides, the last authors who have written on the subject, Weiss, Klostermann, Volkmar, though starting from the most opposite standpoints, agree in treating this writing, which Schleiermacher introduced into criticism, as a chimera.

But what does Weiss do? Remaining attached to the idea of a written source as the basis of our canonical gospels, he ascribes to the original Matthew the "Logia," the part which he refuses to the proto-Mark. Only he is thereby obliged to assign *historical*, and not merely didactic, contents to this writing. No doubt he does not regard it as a complete gospel; he thinks that it contained neither the records of the infancy, nor those of the passion and resurrection. The book of the "Logia" began, according to him, with the baptism; its contents were made up of detached narratives and discourses; it closed with the account of the feast of Bethany. Thereafter came Mark, who labored under the guidance of this apostolic Matthew, and first gave the gospel narrative its complete framework; and those two writings, the "Logia" and Mark, became the common sources of our canonical Matthew and Luke But, 1. If Weiss justly complains that he cannot form a clear idea of the book of the "Logia" as it is represented by Holtzmann (a writing beginning with the testimony of Jesus regarding John the Baptist, and closing with a collection of parables), why not apply the same judgment to the apostolic Matthew of Weiss? What is a book beginning with the baptism and ending with the feast of Bethany, if it is not, to the letter, a writing without either head or tail? 2. Would it not be strange if Mark, the work which tradition declares by the mouth of Papias to be destitute of historical order, were precisely that which had furnished the type of the historical order followed by our synoptics? 3. It follows from the prologue, 1 : 1–4, that when Luke wrote, he had not yet before him any work written by an apostle; and, according to Weiss, he must have had the apostolic Matthew in his hands. 4. While rendering all justice to the perspicacity and accuracy displayed by Weiss in the discussion of texts one is nevertheless painfully affected with the arbitrariness belonging to such a criticism. It always comes in the end to this, to educe the dissimilar from the same. For this end it must be held, unless one is willing to throw himself into the system of wilful and deliberate alterations (Baur), that the acts and sayings of Jesus were an elastic material in the hands of the evangelists, a sort of India rubber which each of them stretched, lengthened, contracted, and shaped at pleasure. Will a supposition which is morally impossible ever lead to a satisfactory result? The last step to be taken on this view was to assign to the "Logia" of Matthew the totality of the gospel narrative; this is what Klostermann has done; and so we are brought

back to the hypothesis which makes our Matthew, or a writing perfectly similar, the principal source of the other two synoptics.

Holtzmann consoles himself for the little agreement obtained by all this labor up till now, by saying that this immense labor, reaching nearly over a century, cannot remain without fruit. But on a mistaken route it is possible to perform prodigies of agility, to take marvellous leaps, to make forced marches, without advancing a step toward the goal, because the direction is perverse. Such appears to us to be the condition in which criticism has labored so energetically. Far, then, from seeking still to advance like Weiss* in this direction, the time seems to us to have come for retracing our steps, in order to recover the way which Luke himself indicated, and which Gieseler brought to light. True, the attempt made by this eminent historian has not been followed; but rather than turn away from it with disdain, criticism should have sought to supply what in it was defective. This is what we shall attempt to do.

II.

If, in the systems which we have passed in review, the difficulty is to reconcile the *differences* between our gospels with the use of common written sources, or with the dependence which they must be supposed to have on one another, the difficulty for us will be to explain, without such dependence and without such a use, the *resemblances* which in so many respects make those three writings, as it were, one and the same work: resemblance in the plan (omission of the journeys to Jerusalem), resemblance in the sequence of the narratives (identical cycles); resemblance in the matter of the narratives; resemblance sometimes even in details of style. To solve the problem, let us begin by ascending to the source of this river, with its three branches.

After the foundation of the Church, on the day of Pentecost, it was necessary to labor to nourish those thousands of souls who had entered into the new life. Among the means enumerated in the Acts which served to edify the new-born Church, *the apostles' doctrine* (2 : 42) stands in the first place. What does this term mean? It could not suffice to repeat daily to the same persons that proclamation of the death and resurrection of our Lord whereby Peter had founded the Church. It must soon have been necessary to go back on the narrative of Jesus' ministry. But the expression, apostles' *doctrine*, shows that those oral narratives did not bear simply on the acts and miracles of Jesus, but also, and even specially, on His *teachings*. Before Paul and John had set forth our Lord Himself as the essence of the Gospel, the apostles' doctrine could not well be anything else than the reproduction and application of the Master's discourses. One day, therefore, it was the Sermon on the Mount; another, the discourse on the relations between believers (Matt. 18); a third, the eschatological discourse, by means of which the community of the faithful was edified. It was repeated, and then commented on. With the exception of John, the Twelve probably never passed beyond this elementary sphere of Christian teaching. It was still within this that Peter moved in his instructions (*διδασκαλίαι*) as he travelled, and at Rome, at the time of which Papias speaks, and when Mark, his interpreter, accompanied him collecting his narratives. And was it not, indeed, with a view to this special task of "testifying what they had seen and heard," that Jesus had chosen and

* "Das Marcus-Evangelium und seine syn. Parallelen," 1872.

formed the Twelve? Nor were they slow to abandon the other duties with which they were at first charged, such as the *serving of the* common *tables*, in order to devote themselves exclusively to this work (Acts 6).

The rich materials for those recitals (John 21 : 24, 25) must at an early period have become contracted and concentrated, both as regards the discourses and the facts. In respect to the latter, for each category of miracles the attention was given preferentially to one or two peculiarly prominent examples. In respect to the discourses, as these were reproduced not in a historical interest, but with a view to the edification of believers, the apostolic exposition gradually fastened on some specially important points in the ministry of Jesus, such as those of the Sermon on the Mount, of the sending of the Twelve, of the announcement of the destruction of the temple, and to the subjects which Jesus had treated of on those occasions, and with which they connected without scruple the most salient of the other teachings of Jesus of a kindred sort. It was a matter of salvation, not of chronology.

They likewise became accustomed, in those daily instructions, to connect certain narratives with one another which had some intrinsic analogy as a bond of union (Sabbatic scenes, aspirants to the divine kingdom, groups of parables), or a real historical succession (the storm, the Gadarene demoniac, Jairus, etc.). Thus there were formed cycles of narratives more or less fixed which they were in the habit of relating at one stretch ; some cycles united together became groups, traces of which we find in our synoptics, and which Lachmann, in his interesting essay on the subject ("Stud. u. Critik." 1835), has called *corpuscula evangelicæ historiæ ;* for example, the group of the Messianic advent (the ministry of John the Baptist, the baptism and temptation of Jesus) ; that of the first days of the ministry of Jesus (His teachings and miracles at Capernaum and the neighborhood) ; that of the first evangelistic journeys, then of the more remote excursions ; that of the last days of His ministry in Galilee ; that of the journey through Perea ; that of the sojourn at Jerusalem. The order of particular narratives within the cycle, or of cycles within the group, might easily be transposed ; a narrative could not so easily pass from one cycle to another, or a cycle from one group into another.

In this process of natural and spontaneous elaboration, all in the interest of practical wants, the treatment of the Gospel must have imperceptibly taken, even down to details of expression, a very fixed form. In the narrative parts, the holiness of the subject excluded all ornamentation and refinement. The form of the narrative was simple, like that of a garment which exactly fits the body. In such circumstances, the narrative of facts passed uninjured through various mouths ; it preserved the general stamp which it had received when it was first put into form by the competent witness. A little more liberty was allowed in regard to the historical framework ; but, in repeating the words of Jesus, which formed the prominent feature in every narrative, the received form was absolutely adhered to. The jewel remained unchangeable ; the frame varied more. The reproduction of the discourses was more exposed to involuntary alterations. But precisely here the memory of the apostles had powerful helps ; above all, the striking original plastic character of the sayings of Jesus. There are discourses which one might hear ten times without remembering a single phrase verbally. There are others which leave a certain number of sentences indelibly impressed on the mind, and which ten hearers would repeat, many days after, almost identically. Everything depends on the way in which the thoughts are conceived and expressed. Formed within the depths of His soul, the words of Jesus

received under the government of a powerful concentration that settled, finished, perfect impress by means of which they became stereotyped, as it were, on the minds of His hearers. This sort of eloquence, besides, took possession of the whole man; of conscience, by its moral truth; of the understanding, by the precision of the idea; of the heart, by the liveliness of feeling; of the imagination, by the richness of its coloring; and what the whole man has received, he retains easily and faithfully. Finally, the apostles were convinced of the transcendent value of the things which they heard from His mouth; Jesus Himself did not allow them to forget it. They knew that they were called soon to proclaim from the house-tops what was said to them in the ear. They had not heard the warning in vain: "Take heed how ye hear." They conversed daily regarding all that they heard together; and, even during the lifetime of their Master, a common tradition was forming among them. Those sentences standing out in such pure and marked relief graven upon them by frequent repetition, needed only an external call to be drawn forth from their mind in their native beauty, and to be produced almost as they had received them. Indeed, I cannot conceal my astonishment that so great a difficulty should have been found in the fact that the sayings of Jesus are almost identically reproduced in our Gospels. The differences surprise me much more than the resemblances. The source of this fixedness is neither Luke copying Matthew, nor Matthew copying Luke. It is the powerful spirit of a Master like Jesus taking possession of the minds of simple, calm, and teachable disciples like the apostles. This was precisely the result aimed at by that order of providence whereby His Father had brought to Him as disciples, not the scribes and the learned of the capital, but little children, new bottles, *tabulæ rasæ*.

In the first times, evangelization was carried forward in Aramaic, the language of the people and of the apostles. And the poverty of this language, both in syntactical forms and in its vocabulary, also contributed to the fixity of the form which tradition took. But there was, even at Jerusalem, a numerous Jewish population which spoke only Greek—the Hellenistic Jews. They possessed in the capital some hundreds of synagogues, where the Old Testament was known only in the translation of the LXX. From the time when the Church welcomed Jews of this class—and that was from its cradle, as is proved by the narrative Acts 6—the need of reproducing in Greek the apostolic system of evangelization must have made itself imperiously felt. This work of translation was difficult and delicate, especially as regarded the sayings of Jesus. It was not done at random; those of the apostles who knew Greek, such as Andrew, Philip (John 12), and no doubt Matthew, did not fail to engage in it. There were especially certain expressions difficult to render, for which the corresponding Greek term required to be carefully selected. Once found and adopted, the Greek expression became fixed and permanent; so the words ἐπιούσιος (*daily*) in the Lord's Prayer, and πτερύγιον (*pinnacle*) in the narrative of the temptation—expressions which have been wrongly quoted to prove the mutual dependence of our Gospels on a common written source.* From this Greek mould into which the primitive tradition was cast, it could not but come forth with a more fixed character still than it already possessed in Aramaic.

It maintained itself, no doubt, for some time in this purely oral form, Aramaic and

* Holtzmann also adduces, in opposition to me, the verb with its double augment ἀπεκατεστάθη, used in the three synoptics. But the various reading ἀποκατεστάθη is found in the three texts, and usage might have consecrated this form with the double augment, as in some other verbs.

Greek. We may apply to the apostles and evangelists, the depositaries of this treasure, what Dionysius of Halicarnassus says of the Homeric logographers: "They distributed their narratives over nations and cities, not always reproducing them in the same order, but always having in view the one common aim, to make known all those memorials, so far as they had been preserved, without addition and without loss." * Basil the Great reports a similar fact: down to his time (four h century) the Church possessed no written liturgy for the Holy Supper — the sacramental prayers and formulæ were transmitted by unwritten instruction.† And was not the immense store of Talmudic traditions, which forms a whole library, conveyed for ages solely by oral tradition?

How was the transition made from oral evangelization to written compilation? The most natural conjecture, adopted by men like Schleiermacher, Neander, and even Bleek, is that they began by writing, not a Gospel—that would have appeared too great an undertaking—but detached descriptions and discourses. It was a hearers who desired to preserve accurately what he had heard, an evangelist who sought to reproduce his message more faithfully. At a time when books of prophecy were composed under the names of all the ancient Israelitish personages (Enoch, Esdras, etc.), when collections of apocryphal letters were palmed off on the ancient Greek philosophers—a Heraclitus, for example ‡—who would be astonished to find that, among the fellow-laborers and hearers of the apostles, there were some who set themselves to put in writing certain acts and certain discourses of the man whose life and death were moving the world? Those first compositions might have been written in Aramaic and in Greek, at Jerusalem, Antioch, or any other of the lettered cities where the Gospel flourished.

Those *adversaria*, or detached accounts taken from the history of Jesus, were soon gathered into collections more or less complete. Such were probably the writings of the πολλοί mentioned in Luke's prologue. They were not organic works, all the parts of which were regulated by one idea, like our Gospels, and so they are lost —they were accidental compilations, simple collections of anecdotes or discourses; but those works had their importance as a second stage in the development of Gospel historiography, and a transition to the higher stage. Thus were collected the materials which were afterward elaborated by the authors of our synoptic Gospels.

In oral tradition thus formed, and then in those first compilations and collections of anecdotes, do we not possess a basis firm enough on the one hand, and elastic enough on the other, to explain the resemblance as well as the diversity which prevails between our three synoptics; and, in fine, to resolve that complicated problem which defies every attempt at solution by so unyielding an expedient as that of a written model?

1. The most striking feature of resemblance in the general plan, the omission of the journeys to Jerusalem, is explained, not perhaps fully, but at least more easily, in the way which we propose than in any other. Oral tradition becoming condensed in the form of detached narratives, and afterward grouped in cycles, the journeys to Jerusalem, which did not lend themselves so easily to the end of popular evangelization as the varied scenes and very simple discourses of the Galilean ministry, were

* "Judic. de Thucyd." ii. p. 138, edit. Sylburg (quoted by Gieseler).

† "De Spir. Sanct." c. 27.

‡ Bernays, "Die Heraclitischen Briefe" (three of which, according to this critic, belong to the first century of our era).

neglected. The matter took shape without them ; and so much the more because they did not enter into any of the groups which were formed. When the tradition was compiled, this element in it was wanting, and the gap was not filled up till later, when the narrative of an eye-witness (John) gave a new delineation of the ministry of Jesus in a manner completely independent of the traditional elaboration.

2. If our narratives have such a traditional origin as we have indicated, we can easily explain both the identical series of accounts which we sometimes meet in our synoptics, and the transposition of particular accounts.

3. The resemblances in the substance of the narratives are explained quite naturally by the objectivity of the facts which left its stamp on the recital ; and the differences, by the involuntary modifications due to oral reproduction and to the multiplicity of written compends. There is one thing especially which is naturally accounted for in this way. We have again and again remarked, especially in the accounts of miracles, the contrast which obtains between the diversity of the historical framework in the three synoptics, and the sameness of the sayings of Jesus during the course of the action. This contrast is inexplicable if the writings are derived from one another or from a written source. It is easily understood from our view ; the style of the sayings of Jesus had become more rigidly fixed in traditional narration than the external details of the Gospel scenes.

There remain the resemblances of style between the three writings—the identical clauses, the common expressions, the syntactical forms or grammatical analogies. If oral tradition became formed and formulated, as we have said, if it was early compiled in a fragmentary way, if those compilations were used by the authors of our Gospels, those resemblances no longer present anything inexplicable, and the difference which alternate with them at every instant no longer require to be explained by forced expedients. The two phenomena, which are contradictory on every other hypothesis, come into juxtaposition, and harmonize naturally.

Starting from this general point of view, let us seek to trace the special origin of each of our three synoptics. The traditions agree in ascribing to Matthew the first Gospel compilation which proceeded from an apostle. It was, according to Irenæus, "at the time when Peter and Paul were together founding the Church at Rome" (from 63–64), or, according to Eusebius, "when Matthew was preparing to go to preach to other nations" (after 60), that this apostle took pen in hand. This approximate date (60–64) is confirmed by the warning, in the form of a parenthesis, which we find inserted by the evangelist in the eschatological discourse of Jesus (24 : 15). Our Lord declares to the disciples the sign by which the Christians of Judea shall recognize the time for fleeing from the Holy Land ; and Matthew adds here this remarkable *nota bene :* "Whoso readeth, let him understand." * This parenthesis contains the proof that, when this discourse was compiled, the Judeo-Christian believers had not yet retired beyond the Jordan, as they did about the year 66. What was the writing of Matthew ? Was it a complete Gospel ? The reasons which we have indicated rather lead us think that the apostle had compiled in Aramaic the great bodies of discourses containing the doctrine of Jesus, as it had been put into form by tradition, with a view to the edification of the flocks in Palestine. It is those bodies of discourses which are the characteristic feature of our first Gospel ; it

* This warning is not connected with the quotation from Daniel, and forms no part of the discourse of Jesus ; this appears from Mark (where the quotation from Daniel is unauthentic).

is round this dominant element that the book appears to be organized all through. The narrative part is an addition to this original theme. It was not composed in Hebrew ; the style does not admit of this supposition. Its date is a little later than that of the apostolic writing. For the presbyter, a native of Palestine, who instructed Papias remembered a time when, in the churches of Judea, they had no Greek translation of the "Discourses of Jesus" (the Logia), and when every evangelist reproduced them in Greek *viva voce, as he could.* What hand composed this historical narrative, in the framework of which the whole contents of the Logia have been skilfully distributed ? Is it not most natural to suppose that one of Matthew's disciples while reproducing his Logia in Greek, set them in a complete narrative of the life of Jesus, and borrowed the latter from the traditional recital in such form as he had frequently heard it from the mouth of that apostle ? This tradition had taken, in the hands of Matthew, that remarkably summary and concise character which we have so often observed in the first Gospel. For his aim was not to describe the scenes, but merely to demonstrate by facts the thesis to which his apostolic activity seems to have been devoted : Jesus is THE CHRIST. The Logia seems also to have been arranged with a view to this thesis. Jesus the legislator, Matt. 5–7 ; the king, chap. 13 ; the judge, chap. 24, 25 ; consequently THE MESSIAH. Comp. Matt. 1 : 1.

Mark, according to tradition, wrote during, or shortly after, Peter's sojourn at Rome, about 64 ; consequently almost at the same time as Matthew. So, like Matthew, he records in the eschatological discourse the warning which it was customary in Palestine to add to the sayings of Jesus regarding the flight beyond the Jordan (13 : 14). The materials of his Gospel must have been borrowed, according to tradition, from the accounts of Peter, whom Mark accompanied on his travels. Accordingly, he could not have used our first Gospel, which was not yet in existence, nor even the Logia, which could not yet have reached him. How, then, are we to explain the very special connections which it is easy to establish between his writing and the first Gospel ? We have seen that this latter writing has preserved to us essentially the great didactic compositions which are the fruit of Matthew's labor, but set in a consecutive narrative. From whom did this narrative proceed ? Indirectly from Matthew, no doubt ; but in the first place from Peter, whose influence had certainly preponderated in the formation of the apostolic tradition in all that concerned the facts of our Lord's ministry. The only difference between the first two Gospels therefore is, that while the one gives us the apostolic system of evangelization in the summary and systematic form to which it had been reduced by the labors of Matthew, the other presents it to us in all its primitive freshness, fulness, and simplicity, as it had been heard from the lips of Peter, with the addition of one or two of the great discourses (chaps. 3 and 13) due to the labors of Matthew (chaps. 12 and 24), and with which Mark had long been acquainted as a hearer of the Palestinian preaching.* The special differences between the two compilations are explained by the variable element which is always inevitable in oral evangelization.† It may thus

* If Mark knew those discourses so well, he must have been acquainted with the Sermon on the Mount. Its place even is clearly indicated in his narrative (between vers. 19 and 20 of chap. 3). The only reason for his omitting this discourse must have been, that it did not fit in sufficiently to the plan of his Gospel, intended, as it was, for Gentile readers.

† We can understand the series of evidences by which Klostermann has been led to regard the text of Mark as merely that of Matthew enriched with scholia due to the narratives of Peter. But what is to be made of the series of opposing evidences which we have so often enumerated ?

be concluded that the first Gospel contains the work of Matthew, completed by the tradition which emanated from Peter; and the second, the tradition of Peter, completed by means of some parts of Matthew's work.

Luke, according to the tradition and evidences which we have collected, must have composed his history in Greece at the same time when Matthew was compiling his Logia in Palestine, and Mark the narratives of Peter at Rome. If so, it is perfectly clear that he did not know and use those writings; and this is what exegesis demonstrates. From what sources, then, has he drawn? He has worked—as appears from our study of his book—on written documents, mostly Aramaic. But how are we to explain the obvious connection in certain parts between those documents and the text of the other two Syn.? It is enough to repeat that those documents, at least those which related to the ministry of Jesus from His baptism onward, were compilations of that same apostolic tradition which forms the basis of our first two Gospels. The relationship between our three Gospels is thus explained. The Aramaic language, in which the most of Luke's documents were written, leads to the supposition that they dated, like those from which the same author composed the first part of the Acts, from the earliest times of apostolic evangelization. At that period the didactic exposition of Jesus' doctrine was probably not yet concentrated and grouped, as it was later, about some great points of time and some definite subjects. Tradition preserved many more traces of the various circumstances which had furnished our Lord with a text for His instructions. Hence those precious introductions of Luke, and that exquisite appropriateness which lends a new charm to the discourses which he has preserved to us. As to the general concatenation of the Gospel events which we admire in Luke, he owes it undoubtedly to special information. It is of such sources of information that he speaks in his prologue, and which enabled him to reconstruct that broken chain of which tradition had preserved only the rings.

Thus it is that we understand the relations and origin of the synoptics. Is this explanation chargeable with compromising the Gospel history, by making its accuracy depend on a mode of transmission so untrustworthy as tradition? Yes, if the period at which we are led to fix the compilation of those oral accounts was much more advanced. But from 60 to 65, tradition was still under the control of those who had contributed to form it, and of a whole generation contemporary with the facts related (1 Cor. 15 : 6, written in 58). In those circumstances, alterations might affect the surface, not the substance of the history.

I would take the liberty of closing this important subject with an apologetic remark. There is perhaps no more decisive proof of the authenticity of the sayings of Jesus than the different forms in which they are transmitted to us by Matthew and Luke. An artificially composed discourse, like those which Livy puts into the mouth of his heroes, is one utterance; but the discourses of Jesus, as they are presented to us by the two evangelists, are broken and fragmentary. Moreover, those similar materials, which appear in both in entirely different contexts, must necessarily be more ancient than those somewhat artificial wholes in which we now find them. Those identical materials put to use in different constructions must have belonged to an older edifice, of which they are merely the débris.

CHAPTER IV.

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE CHURCH.

To get rid of the Mosaic revelation, rationalism has assumed an original contrast between Elohism and Jehovism, and sought to make the history of Israel the progressive solution of this antagonism ; and in the same way, to reduce the appearing of Christianity to the level of natural events, the Tübingen school has set up a contrast between apostolic Judeo-Christianity and the Christianity of Paul—a contrast the gradual solution of which is made to explain the course of history during the first two centuries. Reuss and Nicolas, without altogether sharing, especially the first, in this point of view, nevertheless retain the idea of a conflict between the two fractions of the Church, profound enough to lead the author of the Acts to the belief that he must seek to disguise it by a very inaccurate exposition of the views and conduct of his master Paul. But if we cannot credit this writer in regard to things in which he took part, how are we to found on his narrative when he describes much older events, such as those which are contained in his Gospel? The importance of the question is obvious. Let us attempt, before closing, to throw light upon it.

To prove the antagonism in question, the Tübingen school in the first place advances the different tendencies which are said to be observable in the Gospels. But it is remarkable that, to demonstrate this conflict of tendencies, Baur was forced to give up the attempt of dealing with known quantities, our canonical Gospels, and to have recourse to the supposition of previous writings of a much more pronounced dogmatic character, which formed the foundation both of our Matthew and of our Luke, to wit, a primitive Matthew, exclusively legal and particularistic, and a primitive Luke, absolutely universalistic and antinomian. Thus they begin by ascribing to our Gospels an exclusive tendency ; then, not finding it in the books as we have them, they make them over again according to the preconceived idea which they have formed of them. Such is the vicious circle in which this criticism moves. The hypothesis of an antinomian * proto-Luke has been completely refuted within the Tübingen school itself ; we may therefore leave that supposition aside. There remains only the proto-Matthew. This is the last plank to which Hilgenfeld still clings. He discovers the elements of the primitive Matthew in the fragments which remain to us of the Gospel of the Hebrews. He alleges a natural and gradual transformation of this writing in the direction of universalism (the product being our canonical Matthew) ; afterward Mark, and then Luke, continued and completed the transformation of the Gospel history into pure Paulinism. But this construction is not less arbitrary than that of Baur. The Gospel of the Hebrews, as we have seen, has all the characteristics of an amplified and derived work, and cannot be the basis of our Matthew. Even Volkmar treats this Judaizing proto-Matthew as a chimera, no less than the antinomian proto-Luke. And what of himself? He charges our three synoptics with being Paulinist writings, the sole Judaizing antagonist to which is . . . the Apocalypse. The work of John, such, according to Volkmar, is the true type of legal Judeo-Christianity, the document of which Baur seeks in vain in the primitive

* Our author uses this word, like some others, not in its modern, but its exact sense : the sense of opposition to the Mosaic ritual.—J. H.

Matthew, which is invented by himself to meet the exigency of the case. But what ! we ask Volkmar, can you regard as strictly legal a writing which calls the Jewish people the synagogue of Satan (Rev. 3 : 9), and which celebrates with enthusiasm and in the most brilliant colors the entrance into heaven of innumerable converts of every nation, and tribe, and people, and tongue, who were notoriously the fruits of the labors of the Apostle Paul ; which proclaims aloud the doctrine of the divinity of Jesus-Messiah, that perpetual blasphemy to the ears of the Jews ; and which, instead of deriving salvation from circumcision and works, makes it descend from the throne of God and of the Lamb, of pure grace through faith in the blood of the Lamb, without any legal condition whatever ? Such Judeo-Christianity, assuredly, is a Paulinism of pretty strong quality. And the apostle of the Gentiles would have asked nothing better than to see it admitted by all his adversaries. He would very quickly have laid down his arms.*

Baur further alleges the authentic epistles of Paul (the four great ones), especially the second chapter of Galatians. The following are the contents of the passage. Paul gives an account of a private conference (*κατ' ἰδίαν δέ*) which he had with those of the apostles who enjoyed the highest consideration (*τοῖς δοκοῦσι*), in which he stated to them (*ἀνεθέμην*) his mode of preaching among the Gentiles—a method which they so fully approved, that Titus, an uncircumcised Gentile, was immediately welcomed and treated at Jerusalem as a member of the Church (ver. 23). And if he held out in this case, though circumcision was in his view merely an external rite, and morally indifferent (1 Cor. 7 : 18, 19), it was not from obstinacy, but because of *false brethren unawares brought in* (*διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους*) who claimed the right to impose it, and who thus gave to this matter the character of a question of principle (vers. 4, 5). Then, from those intruded false brethren, Paul returns to the apostles, whom he contrasts with them (*ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων*), and who, that is, the apostles, added no new condition to his statement (*οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο*, referring to the *ἀνεθέμην*, ver. 2), but recognized in him the man called to labor specially among the Gentiles, as in Peter the man specially charged with the apostolate to the Jews ; and on this basis they associated themselves with him and his work, by giving him the right hand of fellowship (vers. 6–10). That there was any shade of difference between him and the Twelve, Paul does not say ; we may conclude it, however, from this division of labor in which the conference terminated. But that this shade was an opposition of principle, and that the Twelve were radically at one with the false brethren brought in, as Baur seeks to prove, is what the passage itself absolutely denies. The contrary also appears from the second fact related by Paul in this chapter—his contention with Peter at Antioch. For when Peter ceases all at once to mingle and eat with the Christians from among the Gentiles, for what does Paul rebuke him ? For not walking uprightly, for acting hypocritically, that is to say, for being unfaithful to his real conviction, which evidently assumes that Peter has the same conviction as Paul himself. And this is a passage which is to prove, according to Baur, the opposition of

* Chap. 2 : 29 is alleged, where a woman is spoken of who teaches to eat meats sacrificed to idols, and to commit impurity—a woman who, it is said, represents the doctrine of Paul. But to teach to eat meats offered in sacrifice is to stimulate to the eating of them as such, that is to say, basely and wickedly outraging the scruples of the weak, or even with the view of escaping some disagreeable consequence, such as persecution, making profession of paganism. Now Paul, 1 Cor. 10, prescribes exactly the opposite line of conduct ; and as to impurity, we have 1 Cor. 6. It is libertinism and not Paulinism which is here stigmatized.

principle between Paul and Peter. That here again there is a shade of difference implied between Paul and Peter, and even between Peter and James ("before that certain came from James"), I am not concerned to deny. But no opposition of principle between Peter and Paul is compatible with this account. Baur has further sought to rest his view on the enumeration of the parties formed at Corinth. According to 1 Cor. 1 : 12, there were believers in this city who called themselves some of Paul, some of Apollos, some of Cephas, others of Christ. Baur reasons thus : As the first two parties differed only by a shade, it must have been the same with the latter two ; and as it appears from 2 Cor. 10 : 7, 11 : 22, that those who called themselves of Christ were ardent Judaizers who wished to impose the law on the Gentiles, the same conviction should be ascribed to those of Peter, and consequently to Peter himself. But the very precise enumeration of Paul obliges us, on the contrary, to ascribe to each of the four parties mentioned a distinct standpoint ; and if, as appears from 2 Cor., those who are Christ's are really Judaizers, enemies of Paul, the contrast between them and those of Cephas proves precisely that Peter and his party were not confounded with them ; which corresponds with the contrast established in Gal. 2 between the false brethren brought in and the apostles, especially Peter. The epistles of St. Paul, therefore, do not in the least identify the Twelve with the Judaizers who opposed Paul ; consequently they exclude the idea of any opposition of principle between apostolic Christianity and that of Paul.

What, then, to conclude, was the real state of things? Behind Judeo-Christianity and the Christianity of the Gentiles there is Christ, the source whence everything in the Church proceeds. This is the unity to which we must ascend. During His earthly life, Jesus personally kept the law ; He even declared that He did not come to abolish, but to fulfil it. On the other hand, He does not scruple to call Himself the *Lord of the Sabbath*, to pronounce as morally null all the Levitical ordinances regarding the distinction of clean and unclean meats (Matt. 15), to compare fasting and the whole legal system to a worn-out garment, which He is careful not to patch, because He comes rather to substitute a new one in its place. He predicted the destruction of the temple, an event which involved the abolition of the whole ceremonial system. Thus, from the example and doctrine of Jesus two opposite conclusions might be drawn, the one in favor of maintaining, the other of abolishing, the Mosaic law. It was one of those questions which was to be solved by the dispensation of the Spirit (John 16 : 12, 13). After Pentecost, the Twelve naturally persevered in the line of conduct traced by the Lord's example ; and how otherwise could they have fulfilled their mission to Israel? Yet, over against the growing obduracy of the nation, Stephen begins to emphasize the latent spirituality of the Gospel. There follow the foundation of the church of Antioch and the first mission to the Gentiles. Could the thought be entertained of subjecting those multitudes of baptized Gentiles to the system of the law? The apostles had not yet had the opportunity of pronouncing on this point. For themselves, and for the converts among the Jews, they kept up the Mosaic rites as a national institution which must continue till God Himself should free them from its yoke by some positive manifestation or by the return of the Messiah ; but as to the Gentiles, they probably never thought of imposing it upon them. The question had no sooner occurred, than God enlightened them by the vision of Peter (Acts 10). But they were not absolute masters at Jerusalem. There there were many priests and elders of the Pharisees (Acts 6 : 7, 15 : 5) who professed faith in Jesus Christ, and who, from the height of their rabbinical science and theological erudition,

regarded the apostles with a sort of disdain. On the one hand, they were pleased with the propagation of the gospel among the Gentiles ; the God of Israel was thereby becoming the God of the Gentiles, and the whole world was accepting the moral sovereignty of the children of Abraham. But, in order that the end might be fully attained, and their ambition satisfied, it was of course necessary that the new converts should be incorporated with Israel, and that with baptism they should receive circumcision. Only on this condition was the widespread proselytism of Paul acceptable to them. "If I preach circumcision," says Paul, alluding to this class, "the offence of the cross is ceased" (Gal. 5 : 11). That is to say, if only I granted them circumcision, they would concede to me even the cross. It is easy to understand why Paul calls them false brethren, intruders into the Church.

There were thus really two distinct camps among the Christians of Jewish origin, according to the book of Acts as well as according to Paul himself : those who made circumcision in the case of Gentile converts a condition of salvation ; and those who while preserving it in the case of themselves and their children as a national observance, exempted the Gentiles from its obligation (comp. especially Acts 6 : 7, 11 : 2, 15 : 1–5, 24, with 11 : 18, 22, 25 ; 15 : 10, 11, 19–21, with Gal. 23). This last passage, which Baur has used to prove that the narrative of the Acts was a pure romance, on the contrary confirms the contents of Luke's account at every point. At the public assembly described by Luke, to which Paul alludes when relating the private conference (κατ' ἰδίαν δέ, Gal. 2 : 2) which he had with the apostles, it was decided : 1*st*. That converts from among the Gentiles were not at all subject to circumcision and the law ; 2*d*. That the *status quo* was maintained for Judeo-Christians (no one exacted the contrary) : 3*d*. That, to facilitate union between the two different elements of which the Church was composed, the Gentiles should accept certain restrictions on their liberty, by abstaining from various usages which were peculiarly repugnant to Jewish national feeling. These restrictions are nowhere presented as a matter of salvation ; the words, "Ye shall do well," prove that all that is intended is a simple counsel,* but one the observance of which is nevertheless *indispensable* (ἐπάναγκες) for the union of the two parties. Thus presented, they could perfectly well be accepted by Paul, who, in case of necessity, would have admitted, according to Gal. 2, even the circumcision of Titus, if it had been demanded of him on this understanding. But there remained in practice difficulties which certainly were not foreseen, and which were not long in appearing. For Palestine, where the Judeo-Christians formed churches free from every Gentile element, the compromise of Jerusalem was sufficient.

But where, as at Antioch, the Church was mixed, composed of Jewish elders and Gentile elders, how fettered did the daily relations still remain between parties, the one of whom professed to remain strictly faithful to legal observances, while the others polluted themselves every instant in the eyes of the former by contact with unclean objects and the use of meats prepared without any regard to Levitical prescriptions ! How, in such circumstances, was it possible to celebrate feasts in common ; the Agapæ, for example, which preceded the Holy Supper ? When Peter arrived at Antioch, he was obliged to decide and to trace for himself his line of con-

* Zeller attempts to translate εὖ πράξετε by : "Ye shall be saved." These words can only signify, "ye shall do well," or "it shall go well with you." As to the term πορνεία, we think that it is to be taken in its natural sense, and that this vice is here brought into prominence in so strange a way, because, in the eyes of so many Gentiles, it passed for a thing as indifferent as eating and drinking (1 Cor. 6 : 12, 13).

duct. If he remained literally faithful to the letter of the compromise of Jerusalem, there was an end to the unity of the Church in that city where the gospel was flourishing. His heart carried him. He decided for the opposite view. He set himself to live with the Gentiles, and to eat as they did (Gal. 2 : 14). But thereupon there arrived emissaries from James, the man who, in the great assembly, had proposed the compromise. They demonstrated to Peter that, according to the terms of this arrangement, he was in fault, because, as a Jew, he should not dispense with the observance of the law ; Barnabas himself had nothing to answer. They submitted, and withdrew from intercourse with the Gentiles. The fact was, that the compromise had not anticipated the case of mixed churches, in which the two elements could unite only on one condition : that *Jewish Christians* on their side should renounce part of their legal observances. We can easily understand, even from this point of view, why St. Paul, in his letters, did not insist on this decree, which left so grave a practical difficulty untouched.

There prevailed, therefore, not *two* points of view, as Baur alleges, but four at least : 1*st*. That of the ultra-legalists, the *Judaizers* properly so called, who perpetuated the law as a principle in the gospel. 2*d*. That of the *Twelve* and of the moderate Judeo-Christians, who personally observed the law as an obligatory ordinance, but not at all as a condition of salvation, for in that case they could not have released the Gentiles from it. Among them there existed two shades : that of Peter, who thought he might subordinate obedience to the law in mixed churches to union with the Gentile party ; and that of James, who wished to maintain the observance of law even in this case, and at the expense of union. 3*d*. *Paul's* point of view, according to which the keeping of the law was a matter morally indifferent, and consequently optional, *even in the case of Judeo-Christians*, according to the principle which he expresses : " To them that are under the law, as under the law ; to them that are without the law, as without law ; all things to all men, that I might save the more" (1 Cor. 9 : 20, 21). 4*th*. Finally, an *ultra-Pauline* party, which is combated by the Apocalypse and by Paul himself (1 Cor. 8 and 10 ; Rom. 14), which ridiculed the scruples of the weak, and took pleasure in braving the dangers of idolatrous worship, and thus came to excuse the most impure excesses (1 Cor. 6 ; Rev. 2 : 20). The two extreme points of view differed *in principle* from the intermediate ones. But the latter differed only on a question of ceremonial observance in which, as was recognized on both sides, salvation was not involved. We may put the difference in this form : the conscience of Paul derived this emancipation from the law from the first coming of Christ, while the Twelve expected it only at His second coming.

What has this state of things, so nicely shaded, in common with the flagrant antithesis to which Baur attempts to reduce this whole history ? As if in such moral revolutions there was not always a multitude of intermediate views between the extremes ! Let the time of the Reformation be considered : what a series of view-points from Luther, and then Melancthon on to the ultra-spiritualists (the *Schwarmgeister*), without reckoning all the shades in the two camps catholic and philosophical !

But after having established, in opposition to Baur, the general trustworthiness of the description given by the author of the Acts, must we abandon Luke to the criticisms of Reuss and Nicolas, leaving him charged by the first with instances of " conciliatory reticence," and by the second " with a well-marked desire to bring the views of St. Paul into harmony with those of the Judaizing [apostles] ?" The ground for those charges is especially the account Acts 21. James declares to Paul, who has just

arrived at Jerusalem, that he has been calumniated to the Judeo-Christians of Palestine, having it said of him that he seeks everywhere to lead his Jewish converts *to forsake Moses;* and to prove the falsehood of this accusation, Paul agrees to carry out the Nazarite vow in the temple with four Judeo-Christians. But in what is this conduct, which the author of the Acts ascribes to Paul, contrary to the apostle's principles as he lays them down in his epistles? Did Paul ever in any place act the fanatical destroyer of the legal economy? Can a case be cited in which he sought to prevail on a Jewish Christian not to circumcise his children? He resolutely refused to allow the yoke of the law to be imposed on the Gentiles; but did he ever seek to make a Jew throw it off? At Antioch, even, would he have censured Peter as he does, if the latter had not previously adopted an entirely different mode of acting Gal. (2 : 14–18)? Did not Paul himself practise the principle: *to them who are under the law, as under the law?* He could therefore in good earnest, as Luke relates, seek to prove to the Judeo-Christians of Palestine that he was moved by no feeling of hostility to the law, and that he was far from teaching the Jews scattered over Gentile lands to abjure the law and *forsake Moses.*

The fundamental error of that whole view which we are combating, is its mistaking more or less the powerful unity which lies at the foundation of the Church. What would be said of a historian who should allege that the Reformation proceeded from the conflict between the Lutheran Church and the Reformed, and who should overlook the essential unity which was anterior to that division? Is it not committing the same error to make the Church proceed from a reconciliation of Judeo-Christianity with Paulinism? But have not those two currents, supposing them to be as different as is alleged, a common source which men affect to lay aside—namely, Jesus Christ? Is this question of the law, on which division took place, the grand question of the N. T.? Is not its place secondary in comparison with that of faith in Christ? Was it not accidentally, and on occasion of the practical realization of the postulates of faith, that the question of the law emerged? And how then could the antagonism which manifested itself on this head be the starting-point of the new creation? Baur, in order to escape the true starting-point, conceives an original antagonism between two extreme tendencies, which gradually approximated, and ended, in virtue of reciprocal concessions, by uniting and forming the great Catholic Church at the end of the second century. We shall oppose history to history, or rather history to romance, and we shall say: In Christ the Spirit remained enveloped in the form of the letter. The Church was founded; within its bosom a tendency continued for a time to keep up the letter *by the side* of the Spirit; the other was already prepared to sacrifice the letter to the free unfolding of the Spirit. But they were at one on this point, that for both life was only in the Spirit. From both sides there went off extreme parties, as always happens, Judaizers to the right, Antinomians to the left; on the one hand, Nazarite and Ebionite communities landing in the Clementine Homilies, which sought to combine Paul and Simon Magus in one and the same person; on the other, the Antinomian exaggerations of the so-called Epistle of Barnabas, and even of that to Diognetus, terminating at length in Marcion, who believed the God of the Jewish law to be a different one from that of the gospel. Between those extremes the Church, more and more united from the time that the destruction of Jerusalem had levelled every ceremonial difference between Judeo-Christians and Gentiles, continued its march; and while casting forth from its bosom Ebionism on the one side, and Marcionism on the other, it closed its ranks under the fire of persecution,

and became the *great Church*, as it is already named by Celsus. Let the documents be studied impartially, and it will be seen whether this picture is not more true to fact than that of Baur.*

And what place, finally, do our four Gospels occupy in this whole? They do not represent four different epochs or four distinct parties. They each represent one of the sides of Christ's glory unveiled to one of the apostles.

The hour of revelation to which the second Gospel belongs is previous to the death and resurrection of Jesus; it is the enlightenment of St. Peter, as indicated by Jesus Himself, when, following up the apostle's profession: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of God," He answers, "Flesh and blood have not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." The divine greatness of Jesus, as it was displayed during the course of His earthly life—such is the idea which fills, penetrates, and inspires the Gospel of Mark.

The time when that inspiration was born which gave rise to the first Gospel came later; it occurs in the interval between the resurrection and ascension. It is the time thus described by Luke (24 : 45): "Then opened He their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures." Christ, the fulfilment of the law and of prophecy—such is the discovery which the spirit made to the apostles in that hour of illumination; the theocratic past stood out before them in the light of the present, the present in the light of the past. This is the view which impelled Matthew to take the pen, and dictated the writing which bears his name.

The inspiring breath of the third Gospel dates from the times which followed Pentecost St. Paul marks this decisive moment with emotion, when he says to the Galatians (1 : 15, 16: "When it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb . . . to reveal His Son Jesus Christ in me, that I might preach Him among the Gentiles." Christ, *the hope of glory* to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews; Christ, the Son of God given to the world, and not merely the son of David granted to Israel—such was the view contemplated by Paul during those three days in which, while his eyes were closed to the light of this world, his soul opened to a higher light. This light with which St. Paul was illuminated passed into the work of Luke; thence it rays forth constantly within the Church.

The lot of John fell to him last; it was the most sublime. "The spirit shall glorify me," Jesus had said; "He shall bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you, and He will show you things to come." Here was more than the work of a day or an hour; it was the work of a whole life. In its prolonged meditations, his profound and self-collected heart passed in review the sayings which had gone forth from the mouth of that Master on whose bosom he had rested and discovered in them the deepest mystery of the faith, the eternal divinity of the Son of man, the *Word made flesh*, God in Christ, Christ in us, we through Christ in God; such, in three words, are the contents of John's writings, especially of his Gospel.

* M. Reuss attaches great importance to the hospitality which Paul meets with in the Roman Church (Phil. 1), and to the almost complete abandonment which he has to endure a little later (2 Tim. 4). But the first passage merely furnishes the proof that the event which Paul had for a long time been expecting (Rom. 16 : 17–20)—the arrival of the *Judaizers* at Rome—had taken place. As to the second event, it cannot (if the 2d Epistle to Timothy is authentic, as we believe it to be, with M. Reuss) have taken place till a second captivity, and after the persecution of Nero had temporarily dispersed the Roman Church. It proves no antipathy whatever on the part of this Church to the apostle.

This view of the relation between God, Christ, and believers, laid down in the fourth Gospel, is alone capable of raising the Church to its full height.

In those four rays there is contained all the glory of Christ. What He was in His visible presence, what He is in relation to the theocratic past, what He is in relation to the religious future of the whole world, what He is in regard to the eternal union of every man with the infinite principle of things—such is the discovery which the Church has before her in those four writings. Were she to deprive herself of one of them, she would only impair the honor of her Head, and impoverish herself. May the Church therefore rather be the focus within which those four rays perpetually converge, and in which they again become one, as they were one originally in the life of the Head!

THE END.

DATE DUE

NOV 24 1982
APR 18 1984
DEC 26 1982
NOV 15 1984
FEB 28 1983
OCT 21 1986
NOV 11 1985
MAR 14 1986
DEC 9 - 1983
FEB 17 1988
MAR 7 - 1984
MAR 10 1989
NOV 3 - 1984
APR 28 1989
DEC 23 1985
OCT 20 1989
JUN 30 1985
OCT 30 1989
SEP 8 - 1983
JUL 06 1990
DEC 21 1986
NOV 11 1991
JUL 14 1988
DEC 14 1992
MAR 9
NOV 07 '96
JUN 4 '71
DEC 19 2000
MAY 24 1977
AUG 5 1977
OCT 11 1977
OCT 12 1983

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.

CENTRAL BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
0 0021 0021950 6

226.407
G582
Godet, Frederic
AUTHOR
A commentary on the Gospel of
TITLE St. Luke.
12537

226.407
G582 Godet, Frédéric
A commentary on the Gospel
of St. Luke.

12537